

JPRS 69720

31 August 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST
No. 10, 1977

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000405 181

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

**Reproduced From
Best Available Copy**

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 69720	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 10, 1977		5. Report Date 31 August 1977	
7. Author(s)		6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.	
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 160
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price PCA08 / MF / A01

31 August 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 10, 1977

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
On the Results of the Visit to France by L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.....	1
Democracy of Developed Socialism.....	3
In the Struggle To Strengthen Peace and Friendship Among Peoples (D. Kunayev).....	17
Problem of the Majority in the Socialist Revolution (Yu. Krasin).....	36
Competition and Economy of Material Resources (Ye. Chernov).....	50
Guarding Socialist Legality (R. Rudenko).....	65
Nucleus of Our Political System (A. Zhabagina).....	80
Main Social Nucleus (M. Dzilyuma).....	83
Civic Duty of the Soviet Soldiers (N. Usenko).....	86
Increased Role of Information in the Development of the Social Sciences (V. Vinogradov).....	89
Right To Creativity (Yu. Melent'yev).....	102

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Permanent Factor of International Life (Yuriy Zhukov).....	115
Some Trends in Foreign Historiography (A. Manfred).....	124
Despotism Without a Mask (S. Zivs).....	133
Two Years of Fruitful Work (Yu. Shiryayev).....	141
Needed and Timely Research (A. Adamishin).....	147
From the Bookshelf.....	151

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST, No 10,
Jul 1977

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : Jul 1977

Signed to press : 13 Jul 77

Copies : 968,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST, 1977

ON THE RESULTS OF THE VISIT TO FRANCE BY L. I. BREZHNEV, CPSU CENTRAL
COMMITTEE GENERAL SECRETARY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDUM OF THE USSR
SUPREME SOVIET

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 3-4

[Text] Having heard the information presented by L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on his visit to France and talks with V. Giscard d'Estaing, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers express their satisfaction with the results of the visit and fully approve Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's activities.

The visit of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to France was a major contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and of its program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples.

Ever since the turn which took place in 1966 as a result of the talks between the Soviet leaders and General de Gaulle, relations between the Soviet Union and France have steadily developed on a solid long-term base. As a result of the talks between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and President V. Giscard d'Estaing the line of good cooperation between the two countries acquired its full confirmation and a new fruitful development.

Important political documents as well as a number of accords aimed at developing and intensifying cooperation between the USSR and France in the political, trade-industrial, and scientific and technical areas were concluded.

The visit by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to France far exceeded the framework of Soviet-French relations. Key problems of contemporary international life were discussed in the course of the talks--consolidation of the peace and detente, elimination of hotbeds of military danger, termination of the arms race, and prevention of the threat of a nuclear war.

The joint declaration on detente signed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and President V. Giscard d'Estaing speaks of the resolve of both countries to follow the path set by the Helsinki conference and act in favor of peace, security, and equal cooperation.

Bearing in mind that detente is developing under complex circumstances and that influential forces which launch sallies against it and try to undermine it remain in the world, the political will of the USSR and France to act in such a way that detente becomes durable and universal acquires particularly important basic significance.

The Soviet-French declaration on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is of great importance. It emphasizes the firm intention of both countries to do everything possible to prevent the further spreading of this mass destruction weapon in the world.

Both sides express themselves in favor of the implementation of measures aimed at disarmament and a productive special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, as well as a world disarmament conference.

The Soviet-French summit talks showed a coincidence of the positions held by the two countries on a broad range of international problems and revealed the joint aspiration to continue to extend the cooperation between the USSR and France to new areas.

Following the Rambouillet meeting, cooperation between the USSR and France has become even more stable and has reached a higher level. Such a development is fully consistent with the interests of the peoples of both countries and the interests of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world.

The visit by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to France is a new substantial contribution to strengthening the traditional friendship between the Soviet and French peoples which is an important guarantee for the solidity of the positive changes achieved in relations between our countries. The development of good neighborly relations and friendship between the Soviet Union and France meets with the active support and favorable response on the part of the broadest possible toiling masses of both countries.

The Soviet people unanimously support the party's Leninist foreign policy and consider the results of the Soviet-French talks in Rambouillet a new proof of the fruitfulness and effectiveness of the course in international affairs formulated at the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses.

5003
CSO: 1802

DEMOCRACY OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 5-16

[Text] The decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which considered and approved the draft of the new USSR Constitution--the constitution of developed socialism--and the presentation of this draft for nationwide discussion are events of tremendous political significance. A new triumphant and touching note can be heard in the circumstances marking the preparations for the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the Soviet system. The discussion of the draft held at plants, factories, kolkhoz and sovkhoz fields and livestock farms, scientific laboratories, student classrooms, labor collectives, and military subunits is developing into a manifestation of a truly nationwide approval and support of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. The entire course of this discussion proves, as of now, that the assessments and conclusions contained in the report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and chairman of the Constitutional Commission, at the May plenum, and the spirit and essential principles of the draft of the fundamental law express the hopes and expectations of the Soviet people, of our entire people. Triggering a new upsurge in the political and labor activeness of the masses in our country, this event was echoed powerfully abroad as well. This confirms the tremendous international prestige of the Leninist party and the Soviet Union and the ever-growing interest expressed in the words and accomplishments of the people pioneering socialism.

The formulation of the draft of the new constitution and its submission to nationwide discussion are the logical consequences of the painstaking and purposeful constructive work tirelessly conducted by the party over many years. The various directions of this work and its most important results and new tasks, interpreted in the light of the specific instructions of the 25th CPSU Congress, have been reduced in the draft within a unified system whose overall meaning is concern for man, for the good of the people, and for peace and social progress. The good of the people has been the superior law governing the existence of our state at all historical stages. It is an expression of the essence of the socialist system and of the nature of our development. The draft of the new USSR Constitution retains and develops the characteristic features of a socialist-type constitution, earmarked by

V. I. Lenin, and many of the essential stipulations of the current constitution. It sums up the entire constitutional experience gained by our country and utilizes the experience of the fraternal socialist countries.

The stipulations and formulas included in the draft of the fundamental law, comprehensively politically weighed and scientifically tested, express briefly and precisely the essence of the major changes which have taken place in our country since the adoption of the 1936 constitution, affecting all sides of social life. Such changes, expressed in the building of a developed socialist society--a crisis-free society, a steadily growing economy, mature socialist social relations, and true freedom--determined the need to make the entire system of power and administrative organs, electoral procedures, and rights and obligations of public organizations and citizens more consistent with the demands of our time.

At the same time the scale of the analysis and summations reflected in the draft enable us to approach everything accomplished by the Soviet people in the past 40 years with a broader historical measure and really experience the organic link of time and continuity between the cause of the October Revolution and our present accomplishments and plans, and to imagine specifically the scope of the practical embodiment of the ideas of the great Lenin, and realize not only the greatness of our past but of our future as well.

The Soviet people created a society of a type unknown previously by mankind, a society with a firm confidence in the future and bright communist prospects. This is codified in the draft as follows: "The supreme objective of the Soviet state is the building of a classless communist society."

Currently the Soviet people are studying and discussing this document which contains a tremendous creative potential.

The elaboration of the draft was preceded by extensive scientific and theoretical study done by the party of the historical laws governing the development of our society, the characteristics of its new stage, the international position of the USSR and world socialism as a whole, and the main trends in changes in international relations. Elaborated with the collective efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and workers parties, the concept of the developed socialist society represents a solid theoretical base for an important political and legal act such as the adoption of the constitution. The report submitted by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary to the May plenum provides a profound and all-round scientific and political substantiation of the need for this step, showing its internal and foreign political significance. This report and the draft of the constitution are another vivid confirmation of the creative force of Marxism-Leninism, the basic scientifically substantiated policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, and the tirelessly purposeful innovational activities of the party's Central Committee, its Politburo, and, personally, of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. They are a confirmation of the inseparable link

between such activities and the study and summation of the live practical experience of the masses and of the organic unity between theory and practice and between words and actions.

The draft of the constitution is based on the very rich experience gained in the molding, renovation, and improvement of Soviet legislation and of the entire legal system and legal control achieved in recent years. At the same time it contains the concentrated political-legal expression and summation of the experience of our entire people, for "Live and creative socialism is the creation of the people's masses themselves" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 57).

The draft depicts the overall aspect of developed socialism in its mature condition. Its features determine the place and historical mission of the Soviet people building communism. The developed nationwide discussion of the draft will inevitably introduce new features in this portrait. Its main lines, however, have already been drawn, not only on paper at that: they have been drawn in life by the confident and firm hand of the working, the toiling man.

The proper practical and theoretical base of the constitution is a prerequisite for its stability and its active influence on the further progress of the Soviet society.

The most characteristic feature of our social development in general and our political system in particular is the combination of stability with dynamism. This feature clearly shows the advantage of the socialist social system: its ability to develop and to grow new aspects on a solid and firm foundation.

The main feature of the new aspect contained in the draft is the expansion and intensification of socialist democracy. This thesis contained in the speech by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the May plenum determines the historical significance and general purpose of the document, and the direction of each of its sections as well as the logical link between them.

Socialism created a new historical type of democracy, a democratic state of a new type. It incomparably broadened the range of democratic principles and freedoms, giving them a new content. The democracy of developed socialism is the natural heir of proletarian democracy created by the working class to insure its own liberation and the liberation of all working people. Overthrowing the power of landlords and capitalists and putting an end, once and for all, to the exploitation of man by man and to class antagonisms and national hostilities, and asserting the public ownership of capital goods, the dictatorship of the proletariat--the initiator of true democracy--became, for the first time in history, the actual power held by the majority of the population--the working people--opening broad possibilities for the development and continuing improvement of the entire democratic system.

In the period since the adoption of the current constitution the country's economy and its entire social aspect have changed drastically. "The common denominator of all these changes has been the growing social homogeneity of the Soviet society. The unbreakable alliance among the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia has become even stronger. Disparities among basic social groups are being gradually eliminated. All nations and nationalities in our country are becoming ever closer to one another in the very course of their life. A new historical community has developed--the Soviet people," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his report on the draft of the new USSR Constitution.

The profound sociopolitical and ideological unity of our people and their close unity around the Leninist party prove that mature socialism has resolved the problem formulated at the dawn of the communist movement: "...make a society of allied people united for the sake of their supreme objectives..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 1, p 373).

Appearing as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat the Soviet state became a state of the whole nation. The working class did not lose but, on the contrary, retained and strengthened even further its leading role in the country's political life, for all social strata converted to its class positions. The leading role of the party of the working class--the Communist Party--increased, having become the party of the entire people and its vanguard. The concept of popular rule was broadened and gained another deeper social content. This historical fact is reflected in the draft which describes our state as the state of the whole people and our party as the vanguard of the entire people, and the draft suggests that the soviets which represent the political foundations of the USSR be named henceforth "soviets of people's deputies."

"The entire power in the USSR belongs to the people." Behind this short line in the draft of the constitution stands the entire heroic history of our people who were the first to give the word "democracy" a true and noble meaning.

Socialist democracy is real democracy. It is rooted in the very thick of the people's life. The reality of socialist democracy consists, above all, of the fact that the liberation from oppression and the acquisition of freedom and equality by the people mean the liberation not only of individuals or groups but of the masses of working people, of millions of people, of entire classes and nations. The position of the individual in society is determined, above all, by the position of the class to which the individual belongs. The bourgeois ideologues who hold forth on human rights and the freedom of the individual fail to mention the fact that bourgeois democracy is stridently indifferent to the rights and freedoms of entire classes, racial and ethnic groups and nations, and the rights and freedoms of millions of people crushed by imperialism.

The reality of socialist democracy consists, furthermore, of the fact that social liberation is based on new relations among people in the material and economic realms. Public ownership and a planned economic system are democratic categories by their very nature. The reality of socialist democracy, finally, consists of the profoundly national nature of our entire social system and the nature of development of the various realms of social life and all levels of social organization, from its foundations to the very top.

The essence of socialist democracy consists of the ever-broader involvement of millions of working people in the administration of social and governmental affairs. This participation is a manifestation of the basic laws of historical progress. The development of socialist democracy is a factual confirmation of Lenin's theoretical conclusion to the effect that "The broader the scope and the width of historical actions, the larger the number of people participating in such actions..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 42, p 140). Making free labor the real content of social life, and raising the daily activities of millions of people to the level of historical activities, and creating the real possibilities for their participation in the administration of society and the state, socialism has thus turned history into the arena of a truly mass and truly historical and conscious activity, and the history of the people into a truly people's history. The draft of the new constitution clearly proves the present scope and width of this historical process. It legally codifies the fact of the conversion of the people into a conscious maker of its own life. This is the deepest social meaning of the development of socialist democracy and its great historical mission.

At the same time, the development of democracy is determined not only by our high humanistic objectives and ideals. The broadest and most active possible participation of the toiling masses in the administration of social and governmental affairs is a vital necessity, an adamant social requirement under socialism.

The developed socialist society--having reached a high level of maturity in the new type of social organization--is a new complex socioeconomic organism. This applies both to the national economy, which represents a comprehensively broken down and, at the same time, an organically integrated national economic complex, and the political realm which is an all-embracing system of governmental and social organizations whose guiding nucleus is the Communist Party. It also applies to the realm of science and culture which has reached an all-round powerful development. The management of this developed organism and the need to take into consideration the tremendous number of various factors and relations among them, as well as the simultaneous and interrelated solution of major economic, social, and political problems pose a problem which cannot be resolved by organizational-technical ways and means alone.

The party considers improvements in the management of the national economy a project of the whole people, presuming the active participation not only of economic managers and specialists but of all working people, and as a

sociopolitical task which presumes the expansion and intensification of socialist democracy, the development of initiative and upgrading the responsibility of everyone for his assignment and for success not only of his own labor collective but of society as a whole. This is one of the greatest advantages of our social system and of its specific management principles and methods. In precisely the same manner the party considers the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the combination of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist social system a nationwide task which presumes the involvement of all participants in public production in this process of historical significance.

This equally applies to the entire political system of developed socialism. Under the conditions of the higher role played by each sociopolitical institution within this system (soviets, trade unions, the Komsomol, autonomous organizations, and so forth), their independence, initiative, and activeness increase. This determines the increased role of the party within the political system, as it directs the overall activities of state organs and public organizations. All this, put together, calls for the development of both principles of democratic centralism. The draft of the constitution reemphasizes the significance of this principle: "Democratic centralism combines single management with local initiative and creative activeness and with the responsibility of each governmental organ and every official for assignments."

The development of the democratic principles in production and the participation of the working people in controlling the production process and accelerating scientific and technical progress represent the type of sociopolitical practice which molds and develops the most important political and moral qualities of the individual, a communist outlook, and the ability to think broadly, in a statesmanlike fashion, and to consider common concern as one's own. "That is how political and production tasks blend," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th trade unions congress.

These party stipulations and this approach have been codified in the draft of the fundamental law. The pivotal thought of the draft is that of the indivisibility of socialism and democracy and of the building of communism and the development of popular rule. True democracy is as impossible without socialism as socialism is impossible without democracy. The veracity of this thesis has been confirmed by the entire historical experience.

V. I. Lenin said that "The bourgeoisie establishes or eliminates democracy according to what suits it!" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 188). In the socialist society democracy cannot be either artificially created or arbitrarily "abrogated." In our society democracy is always "suitable" simply because socialism is a society of true freedom, a society in which people develop one another, in which "your" freedom is not a limitation but an extension of "my" freedom, and in which all together and everyone separately could say "our freedom." The socialist state is also the people,

politically united in the soviets and led by its progressive segment--the Communist Party. Article 1 of the draft of the constitution states that "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, and of all nations and nationalities of the country."

The most important feature and advantage of socialist democracy is its depth and comprehensiveness, the purposefulness of its essence, and the variety of development trends, implementation mechanisms, and fullness of reflection not only of the common but the specific interests of classes, social groups of working people, nations, and nationalities. A comprehensive approach to the development of socialist democracy is a characteristic feature of the policy of the CPSU and the state of the whole people.

The draft of the new constitution describes specifically and clearly what the further development of socialist democracy means under contemporary conditions. It means the ever-broader participation of the working people in the administration of social and governmental affairs, improvements in the state apparatus, increased activeness of public organizations, intensified people's control, strengthened legal foundation of state and social life, expansion of public information, and constant consideration of public opinion.

The soviets are the most widespread and most representative and truly internationalist mass organizations of the working people, rallying the entire nation. Over 50,000 local soviets consist of over 2 million deputies elected by the whole people and representing all population strata. Two-thirds of them are workers and kolkhoz members. The others are teachers, workers in science and culture, party and trade union workers, specialists in all economic sectors, and members of the military. They are assisted in their work by nearly 30 million citizens who make up the aktiv of the soviets. The soviets organically combine the democratic governmental principle with public self-administration. The recent elections for local soviets were a real triumph of socialist democracy. Over 166 million voters, or 99.98 percent of the electorate, participated in the elections. The composition of the elected deputies reflects profoundly and fully the social structure of our society and the unity and inviolable friendship among the peoples of our country. The soviets are a live, mobile, and constantly self-renovating organization of the people. Nearly 1 million deputies were elected for the first time at these elections. The elections convincingly confirmed the truly popular composition of the soviets. The uninterrupted democratization of the soviets in terms of the development of their principles of electiveness, replaceability, accountability, and publicity is a law governing the development of the socialist political system.

The draft of the constitution directs the attention, above all, to the further development of the democratic principles governing the establishment and activities of the soviets and the intensification of their role in the solution of the most important problems of social life. The draft clearly

formulates the range of competence of the soviets of all levels. The USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to resolve all problems within the jurisdiction of the USSR. The local soviets resolve not only all problems of local importance but control and coordinate, within the limits of their rights, the work of the other organizations on their territory. Particular emphasis has been placed on the systematic nature of the control exercised by the soviets over the executive and directive organs and the activities of organizations and officials. The strengthening and deepening of relations between soviets and their deputies and the masses is an important indicator of the development of socialist democracy. The draft emphasizes the duty of the soviets and their deputies to regularly inform the population of their activities, to report to the electorate, and to study attentively every suggestion submitted by the working people. Five years ago the Law on the Status of Soviet Deputies was passed. The basic rights which make it possible to enhance even further the role of the deputies, stipulated by this law, have been included in the draft of the constitution.

According to the current constitution individuals not under the age of 23 have the right to be elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and individuals not younger than 21 have the right to be elected to the supreme soviets of union republics. A new aspect of the electoral system is the granting to all Soviet citizens 18 or older that same right. This is a specific manifestation of the party's concern for the young generation of the builders of communism and of its faith in them.

The actual upgrading of the role which mass public organizations play in the country's life--the trade unions, the Komsomol, the cooperatives, and others--has been extensively reflected in the draft. This is a manifestation of the democratization of all social life. It codifies the right to participate in the solution of political, economic, and sociocultural problems, and the right to initiate legislation. The draft also includes a stipulation on the role of collectives of working people--the basic nuclei of our society. This is a manifestation of the party's basic line of development of the democratic principles of production management and of all realms of social life.

The development of socialist democracy in general and of the political system in particular is an objective historical process. The intensification of the scientific approach to the development of democracy is a major feature of our time.

Contemporary bourgeois ideology is doing everything possible to exaggerate the idea of the alleged incompatibility between science and democracy and competence with popular rule. Contrary to the democratic ideals it is formulating all possible concepts regarding "technocracy," "power of knowledge," and reactionary utopias on the future rule of a technocratic and managerial elite, referring in this case to the scientific and technical revolution. The reality of existing socialism clearly proves the poverty and wretchedness of such "philosophy." Socialist democracy is the most

important realm in achieving the alliance between labor and science. The development of democracy is a powerful incentive for increasing the interest in the achievements of human culture and in developing the need for scientific knowledge, including political knowledge. Our country has created and is developing a broad system of political education. The party's entire ideological work is directed toward the dissemination of political and conceptual knowledge among the masses, the conversion of such knowledge into convictions, and the development of the sociopolitical activeness of the working people. The socialist slogan "Knowledge to the Masses!" presumes the dissemination of managerial knowledge as well. As early as the turn of the century K. A. Timiryazev, the great Russian natural scientist, prophetically wrote that "Science based on democracy is strong with the science of democracy and, as a symbol of this alliance--a phenomenon almost unheard of in previous centuries--the democratization of science is the forecast for the future!" This forecast has come true. In our country both the natural and technical as well as the social sciences have become a real social force. This as well is one of the greatest advantages of socialist democracy.

The essence of democracy is not exhausted merely by the indication of who rules. It is also important to know what precisely is the object of democratic rule and control and the way such rule and control are exercised. Socialist democracy is actual democracy rather than a sentence. It is a project shared by everyone. Lenin noted that "In the bourgeois system the work was done by the owners rather than the state organs. In our country economic affairs are our common affairs. To us this is the most interesting policy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 330).

Unlike bourgeois democracy, socialist democracy not only proclaims the principles of popular rule and the equality and freedom of the individual but creates the type of economic, social, political, and cultural conditions in which all members of society can actually participate in all governmental affairs. "Building communism," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "we shall develop democracy ever more broadly. Naturally, it is a question of socialist democracy, i.e., a type of democracy which covers the political, social, and economic areas, a democracy which will insure, above all, social justice and social equality."

It is under socialism that, for the first time in history, all social life and activities become the target of democratic administration and control. The development and expansion of the democracy of mature socialism are expressed in the broadened scale and deepened content of the activities of the state. The draft of the constitution stipulates that the main tasks of the state include "the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, improvement of socialist social relations and their reorganization into communist social relations, the education of the members of the communist society, the enhancement of the material and cultural living standards of the working people, insuring the security of the country, and helping the consolidation of the peace and the development of international cooperation."

For the first time a constitutional text includes a special chapter on problems of social development and culture. This stipulation cannot fail to be warmly supported by the working people. It is based on our objectives, new material possibilities, and new needs. "The supreme objective of social production under socialism," the draft notes, "is the fullest possible satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the people." The main such need is the need for a comprehensively developed, purposeful, and harmonious person. The draft states that "In accordance with the communist ideal that 'the free development of the individual is a prerequisite for the free development of everyone' the Soviet state sets as its goal the broadening of actual possibilities for the development and utilization by the citizens of their creative forces, capabilities, and talents, and for the all-round development of the individual."

The draft of the fundamental law clearly indicates the principal ways and means for the implementation of this objective. This includes concern for improving labor conditions and facilitating the work, converting agricultural labor into a variety of industrial labor, improving the living and working conditions of the rural population, continually raising the level of real income of the working people, and the development of public health, social insurance, consumer services, and the communal economy. For the first time the draft calls for introducing in the constitution a stipulation on the right to housing. The new constitution will be one of the first in the world to proclaim this right of vital importance to man. All this, put together, proves the humanism of developed socialist democracy.

One of the basic problems of democracy is that of the interrelationship between society and the individual, and between the state and the individual; it is the problem of equality and civic freedoms. No democratic system in the past has been able to find an approach, not to speak of a solution, to the resolution of this problem. The reality of socialist democracy is that it not only proclaims the general principle of equality among Soviet citizens, the equality of the rights of men and women, and the equality of the citizens regardless of their national and racial affiliation, but insures this equality in all realms of social life. The radical advantage of socialist democracy is the proclamation and material support of a broad system of socioeconomic rights pertaining to the very foundations of human life. The main among them is the right to work.

The CPSU Central Committee decree on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution stipulates that socialism is a society of liberated labor. Labor has made men. Labor is the most human part of man and the right to work is the right to be a person, an individual. The liberation of man is, above all, the liberation of labor, the main realm of human life, and the main factor in the molding of the individual. The liberation of man from exploitation and from forced labor which maims his personality is the greatest social gain of socialism. The draft of the constitution states that "Socially useful labor and its results determine the position of man in society." The social status of labor along with the

personality of the working man have been raised to an unparalleled level by developed socialism. The draft of the constitution introduces a new important stipulation showing that the right to work is now supplemented by the right to choose one's profession and type of employment and work in accordance with one's vocation, capabilities, professional training, and education and in accordance with the requirements of society. This right is inseparably linked with the right to education, to the utilization of the achievements of culture, science, and technical progress, and the right to participate in the administration of governmental and public affairs. These rights are guaranteed by the development of our entire political, educational, and cultural system, and are materially guaranteed.

Liberated socialist labor is the most important realm for the creation of the spiritual potential of our society and of the human potential of our democracy.

The fact that the position of man in our society is determined by his work is the clearest possible proof of the true freedom of the individual. In the socialist society the nature of a person and his position are determined not by wealth, heredity, or class affiliation or else by a bank account, but by his personal services and work merits. The stipulation of free labor in society is linked with the stipulation of the people's deputy in the political system. The people know their deputies "personally" above all because they carry out their social duties without abandoning their workplace and because they work together with the voters, hand in hand with them. Under socialism labor is inseparably linked with social, political, and governmental activities.

The draft of the new constitution broadens the volume and deepens the content of the political rights and freedoms of the individual. Fully confirming the freedom of speech, press, assembly, meetings, street marches and demonstrations, included in the current constitution, it stipulates the specific means through which every citizen can exercise his right to participate in the administration of public and governmental affairs. The draft formulates the right of the citizen to address himself to public and state organs with suggestions and criticism, to appeal to the courts actions committed by officials, and be protected by the courts against encroachments on his life, health, property, individual freedom, honor, and dignity. Persecution for criticism is banned. "Naturally, Comrades," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "the draft of the constitution is based on the fact that the rights and freedoms of the citizens cannot and must not be used against our social system to the detriment of the interests of the Soviet people." This is not a restriction of democracy but, conversely, concern for its consolidation and safeguard. What is democratic to us is, above all, that which serves the interests of the people, the interests of the building of communism.

The exercise of rights and freedoms is inseparable from the implementation of civic duties. The draft notes that the citizen of the USSR must work conscientiously, safeguard and strengthen socialist property, defend the socialist fatherland, strengthen the friendship among nations and nationalities, be concerned with the education of the children, and be intolerant of antisocial actions. The Soviet citizen must protect the interests of his state and contribute to the strengthening of its power and prestige. It is his international duty to contribute to the development of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of other countries and to the support and consolidation of universal peace.

The development of socialist democracy, the democracy of our union multinational state, is inconceivable without the strengthening and development of the democratic principles in the national-governmental structure. Achieving actual equality among nations is a great historical accomplishment. The way the draft resolves the problem of socialist federalism insures the truly democratic combination of the common interests of the multinational Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with the interests of each of its constituent republics. All-round prosperity and steadfast rapprochement among nations is an important constitutional objective of our state of the whole people.

The inseparable link between rights and obligations and between freedom and responsibilities of the individual, and the good of the individual and the collective, and patriotism and internationalism, as well as the interests of the present and of the future are the sides of the Soviet way of life which constitute the common features of our democracy.

This democracy has not only a spatial but a temporal dimension. The common good is not only the good of those who live today but the good of our offspring. History knows of no other society so directed toward the future and in which this future is so factually present in current affairs. This concern for the future, reflected in the draft of the constitution, is proof of the moral health of the society and of the tremendous moral potential of socialism. The development of socialist democracy is irreversible. It contains "the arrow of time," an arrow indicating the direction toward communism. Concern for the future is also concern for man, not only of the man of the future but of the present. It is actual, practical, and effective humanism. The draft calls for measures for the protection and efficient utilization of the environment and for further improvement not only of the social but of the natural world of man.

The ancient philosophers considered man "a measure of all things." Conversely, contemporary bourgeois civilization has made things the measurement of man. For the first time in history socialism places man in the center of the entire social system, making his development the object and purpose of all social affairs. The greatest right of man is the right to life, stated Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his 29 May 1977 television speech.

"However, we understand life not simply as existence but as existence worthy of man." A life worthy of man is precisely the main objective of all efforts of the Communist Party and the purpose of development of our democracy. It is also the main yardstick of social progress and freedom of the individual.

Mountains of books have been written throughout the entire history of mankind to interpret the content of the word "freedom." All possible meanings have been ascribed to it: freedom of conscience and freedom from conscience, freedom for society and freedom from society, freedom as duty and freedom as irresponsibility, freedom from instincts and freedom of instincts, freedom of thought and freedom not to think, freedom from chains and freedom to put chains on someone!... "...Freedom," Lenin pointed out, "unless subordinated to the interest of liberating labor from the oppression of capital, is a fraud..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 38, p 347). The practical rather than merely theoretical solution of the problem of freedom was provided by socialism. Freedom is, above all, freedom from exploitation, from racial and national oppression, from ignorance, lack of rights and poverty, hunger and disease, fear of the future, exhausting and destroying forced labor, the ghost of an unsecured old age, unemployment, crises, and inflations. All these aspects of freedom have been guaranteed by socialism. Such guarantees are reemphasized in the draft of our constitution. Finally, this is freedom from monstrous destructive wars. The struggle for its firm guarantees is the essence of the foreign policy of the Communist Party and Soviet state.

However, this does not exhaust the entire content of the idea of freedom. Freedom also includes a profound positive meaning: the broader the area of freedom "from" becomes, the more imperative becomes the problem of freedom "to." The theory of Marxism-Leninism, which is the basis of all practical activities of our party and of its entire domestic and foreign policy, provides an expanded and clear answer to this question: freedom gained for the all-round development of the forces and capabilities of everyone through the individual and by the individual through everyone, a development which knows no boundaries or predetermined scales, the development of the mind and will of the individual and of all people together, for the sake of happiness and creativity, construction, and peace.

Reviewing as a whole the constitutional outlines of our sociopolitical and economic system, the Soviet people realize that behind all this stands a single all-embracing scientific thought, inspired by the revolutionary will and by a firm guiding hand. Behind all this stands the Communist Party, the heart and the mind of our democracy. Therefore, discussing the draft of the new constitution, the working people in our country support and approve particularly warmly the lines in the draft which state the following: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the leading and guiding force of the Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system and of all governmental and social organizations. The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people." The election of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, to the position of chairman of the Presidium of the USSR

Supreme Soviet and the head of the Soviet state is a manifestation of the growing role of this leading and guiding force. The people gave their warm approval to this election which has a profound political meaning.

A solid democratic tradition of the broadest possible nationwide consideration of problems of governmental significance has developed in our society. A special article in the draft stipulates that the most important problems of governmental life are submitted to nationwide discussion and nationwide vote (referendum). The very birth of our new constitution and its elaboration and discussion represent an act of the highest possible democracy, an act of a highly solemn political sounding.

The Soviet people have accomplished great historical deeds in the 60 years after the October Revolution. However, their plans are even greater. The new constitution is being discussed in a time when the Soviet people, guided by the Leninist party, are engaged in intensive work for the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. The discussion will contribute to the awakening of new creative forces in the people. The task of the party, soviet, and all public organizations and of information and propaganda organs is to involve in this matter all categories of working people and all population strata, while insuring the maximally most widespread, free, and truly business discussion of the draft of the constitution, and to mobilize these creative forces for the solution of the problems of the 10th Five-Year Plan and in honor of the proper celebration of the 60th anniversary of our revolution. The adoption of the new USSR Constitution will become an important historical landmark along the great path of our people--the path laid by the Great October Revolution.

5003

CSO: 1802

IN THE STRUGGLE TO STRENGTHEN PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP AMONG PEOPLES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 17-32

[Article by D. Kunayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee]

[Text] For almost 6 decades the sail of the ship of history has been filled by the wind of the Great October Revolution. Its powerful force is reaching the most remote corners of the planet. Gradually the world is renovating its face proving the great truth of the doctrine of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

The Great October inaugurated a new epoch--the epoch of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism--the epoch, to use Lenin's words, of the struggle for the liberation of the peoples from imperialism, for an end to wars among nations, for overthrowing capitalist rule, and for socialism.

Everyone knows how the first state of workers and peasants on earth, created by the revolution, began its policy. Its first act was the famous Leninist Decree on Peace which proclaimed the great law of the new epoch--the law of the indivisibility of socialism and peace; it formulated the idea of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems as one of the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The other document--the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia--emancipated once and for all all nations and nationalities in the country, marking the beginning of their new life on the basis of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Therefore, from the very first days of the establishment of the Soviet state the close link between the domestic and foreign policy of our party was manifested. With the advance of universal progress and with the strengthening of the new social system and the increased power and political prestige of the Soviet state this link became even more effective and varied, determining the class direction and organic peacefulness of the foreign policy of existing

socialism, a peacefulness based on the very essence of the socialist system, its nature, and its supreme ideals. Today this link is clearer than ever before.

The ideal of life without wars and of a society unaware of exploitation, oppression, and national discord is deeply rooted in the past. Tremendous calamities and suffering have long motivated progressive social thinking to seek means for their elimination. The peoples dreamed of peace and friendship.

The outstanding sons of the Russian people and of Russia--Aleksandr Radishchev, Pavel Pestel', Vissarion Belinskiy, Nikolay Chernyshevskiy, Nikolay Dobrolyubov, and many others who were, as Gertsen said, "outside the palace and the insignia of rank," greeted their oppressed brothers and offered them a helping hand.

History has recorded forever the names of Ukrainians Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko, Belorussians Maksim Bogdanovich and Yanko Kupala, Georgian Akakiy Tseretel, Azerbaydzhani Mirza Akhundov, Uzbek Khakim-zade Khamza, Kazakhs Chokan Valikhanov and Abay Kunanbayev, Armenian Ovanes Tumanyan, Latvian Yan Raynis, and many others who dreamed of the future "when," as Pushkin said, "having somewhat forgotten their quarrels, the people will merge in a great family."

The peoples of our huge country not only aspired to a bright future but struggled for it. The traditions of class solidarity among working people of different nationalities developed in the course of centuries of economic, political, and cultural relations and of joint struggle against social and national oppression.

Having discovered the decisive role of the people's masses in history, Marxism-Leninism alone indicated the real path to the salvation of mankind from military catastrophes and the establishment of a lasting peace on earth. The achievement of this noble objective is dictated by communist ideology which, by its very nature, is profoundly internationalist and imbued with the ideas of equality, fraternity, and unity among working people of all races and nationalities. Expressing the interests of the working class and all working people, our ideology is consistent with the expectations and aspirations of all nations.

The CPSU values the trust of the working people and protects the loyalty to Lenin's behests. Today we could speak with full justification and right of the truly Leninist work style of its Central Committee and Politburo, headed by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, the outstanding governmental and political leader of our time, loyal Marxist-Leninist, and firm fighter for peace throughout the world. This style is characterized by the highest principled-mindedness, a truly scientific and class internationalist approach, and profound penetration into the very core of the basic problems of world developments.

I

Socialism and peace are indivisible. This most important Leninist concept reflects the peace-promoting mission of socialism. Without an aspiration toward peace among nations and without an inner need to strengthen it neither a society of full social equality nor the blossoming of the individual would be possible.

The history of our party is full of bold and ever more successful initiatives in this direction. It is characterized by a clear dialectical inter-connection between domestic and foreign policy.

The Great October Socialist Revolution extracted our homeland from the bloody abyss of World War I and insured its independent development and all-round progress. Real possibilities and ways for socioeconomic and cultural blossoming were offered to the peoples.

It must be said that the true communists have never been indifferent to the means for the revolutionary accomplishment of their supreme objective. Revolution does not mean anarchy, arbitrariness, or unbridled violence as our ideological opponents, the "mandarins of regression," as F. Engels described them, are trying to claim provocatively. The nature of the socialist revolution does not contain violence and cruelty but a class awareness of humanism, social justice, and creative construction. It is precisely all this that determined and determines the historical experience of the CPSU.

The close cooperation, unity, and solidarity of the peoples of the Soviet state, headed by the heroic Russian working class, were hammered out and strengthened in the course of the revolution and in the battles of the civil war and against the foreign intervention, and in surmounting the numerous difficulties and enemy intrigues. We had to experience a great deal and feel to their fullest extent the bitterness of temporary failures and the bright happiness of victories before the new historical community--the Soviet people--developed.

Our enemies did not include only those who did not share our views and who hindered us actively by the force of arms, through conspiracies, sabotage, and intervention, but the heritage of the old world itself--economic, ideological, and social.

The boundless trust of the peoples of Russia, suppressed and tortured by the cruel colonial policy of tsarism and its many foreign companions in the unbridled plunder of the natural resources of the national outlying areas, could be gained not through high-sounding phraseology but only through a real policy consistent with the basic interests of the toiling masses.

The peoples of Russia heard a great deal of all possible slogans and beautiful promises made by political windbags, speculators, and demagogues. The provisional government and its leader, Kerenskiy, who is being praised of late in the West evermore frequently as a leader who, allegedly, intended to resolve the national problem in an exemplary fashion, and who replaced the tsar, were equally generous in their promises.

Let us recall in this connection for these gentlemen who retroactively make black look white the statement made by Kerenskiy in the State Duma on 13 December 1916, before he had become prime minister. Here is what he said then: "...Turkestan and the Kirgiz (i.e., Kazakh--the author) steppe oblasts are not Tul'skaya or Tambovskaya Guberniya. They should be looked upon the way the British or the French consider their colonies.

It was the Great October Revolution, the power of the working class, the Bolshevik Party and its Leninist national policy that brought true equality to the peoples of Russia.

Trusting the great Leninist party, the peoples of Russia were not attracted by the false lights of nationalism. They were not misled by its prejudices and demagogic slogans of above-class "unity" against which Lenin and the party waged a most decisive and substantiated struggle.

To us, Marxists-Leninists, Engels' words have always contained a profound social meaning: "...Above all we must retain a truly internationalist spirit which would exclude the appearance of any patriotic chauvinism whatever..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 18, p 500).

It was precisely the revolutionary Russian working class, allied with the multinational peasant poor who inaugurated the new stage in the development of proletarian internationalism, when it began to be systematically embodied in the policy of the government and in the implementation of the course of the ruling party. The party proclaimed the equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia and their right to self-determination, including the right to secede, the elimination of any and all national restrictions, and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups. All class and religious restrictions were abolished. The equality of women and the right to be taught in one's own language in school were proclaimed; the school was separated from the church and the church from the state. Measures were taken to protect national cultural monuments.

The peoples of Russia welcomed such historically unparalleled changes with the greatest satisfaction and joy. Cleaning the Augean Stables from the colonial past, the party created conditions for the total elimination of national mistrust and discord.

The establishment of a fraternal community of free peoples--the USSR--was a real triumph of the idea of internationalism. The internationalist principles of our party found in this historical act a vivid and consistent

embodiment. "The creation of the USSR," L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out, "was the direct continuation of the cause of the Great October Revolution which inaugurated a new era in the development of mankind and a practical embodiment of the ideas of the great Lenin on the voluntary alliance among free nations."

The experience gained in the international unification of the working people is our priceless acquisition. We neither consider it a secret nor do we raise it to a universal level, to the only correct "model," as our enemies claim. The victory of our revolution intensified in all countries the importance of solidarity among progressive forces in the struggle for the social renovation of the world. The first socialist country became the bulwark and support of internationalism, the unfading beacon which shed a bright light over the historical path of the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism.

The great objective formulated by the October Revolution--insuring the steady economic, social, and cultural progress of society--continues to be comprehensively embodied in the party's economic and social strategy. This strategy, profoundly formulated in the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress, stems from the October Revolution, expressing the humanistic nature of socialism.

However fast the rush of history may have been, time has been unable to erase the memory of the way our peoples broke forever with the Middle Ages and entered the world of socialism filled with feelings of boundless gratitude to one another and, particularly, to the great Russian people for their aid and selflessness in the pursuit of this path, for the greatness of their soul, the goodness of their heart, and their great loyalty to international duty. "...The Russian working class and the Russian people fulfilled this duty honorably," L. I. Brezhnev said. "Essentially, this was a great exploit of the entire class, the entire people, performed in the name of internationalism. This exploit will never be forgotten by the peoples of our homeland."

The new social system alone could turn into reality the greatest achievements of our country in all realms of life. Thus, whereas in 1917 the share of the first socialist state in the world in worldwide industrial output did not amount to even 3 percent, today it accounts for 20 percent of the world's industrial output. This figure appears even more impressive if we take into consideration the horrifying consequences of the wars experienced by the Soviet people. No single capitalist country could have been able to insure such a tempestuous growth of its economic potential within such a short historical time under such circumstances.

Our socialist homeland is justifiably proud of its outstanding accomplishments. We have created a new society the likes of which has been unknown to mankind, a society without crises, with a steadily expanding economy, true freedom and fraternity among peoples, a society in which mature socialist relations and

real freedom of the individual and equality have been established and where a new person has been molded. Through the efforts of the Leninist party the distant possibility in which society and the individual could gain an all-round harmonious development, as dreamed by the best representatives of all times and generations, is becoming reality today.

The outstanding achievements of mature socialism, distinguished by the high economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual development of society are reflected in the draft of the new USSR Constitution--the program document of our time approved at the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. In his report to the plenum L. I. Brezhnev stated that our new constitution will clearly show to the entire world the development of the socialist state, asserting ever more firmly and deeply socialist democracy. It will clearly show what this socialist democracy is, what its essence is. Our new constitution will enrich the common treasury of the experience of world socialism. It will be an inspiring example in the liberation struggle of the working people abroad. The real freedoms and democracy of our system, firmly guaranteeing to the working people and to every Soviet citizen the greatest rights we owe to the October Revolution and Lenin's party, will be revealed again to the entire world in their entirety and greatness.

II

All of us are witnesses to and participants in the main social process of our time. Socialism brought to life previously unheard of constructive forces. It emancipated the creative power concealed within the people. This power was activated by the wonderful force of the great fraternity of peoples united in an unbreakable union by the will of the party.

Let us consider Kazakhstan. Tsarism had taken away from the Kazakh people their land and even their own name. Natural resources were being wasted by foreign concessionaires. The original inhabitants of Kazakhstan were known as men of the steppes, as natives. Millions of nomad Kazakhs had never held a book in their hands. They were unfamiliar with words such as institute, university, academy, theater, or library. Before the revolution only 22 Kazakhs had acquired a higher education. A land which had given mankind thinkers such as the great poet Abay Kunanbayev, the world-famous scientist Chokan Valikhanov, and the outstanding educator Ibray Altynsarin was experiencing the tragedy of spiritual and social backwardness.

It would be difficult to say what would have happened to many peoples of our country without the Great October Revolution. After the revolution, in a few years, all of them covered a distance equal to centuries. This is no exaggeration but a fact which became reality thanks to the Leninist national policy followed by our party.

The working people of our republic, like those of all fraternal republics, are legitimately proud of the fact that the great Lenin was at the origins of their Soviet national statehood.

Nothing was ignored by Vladimir Il'ich: the Ridder mines, the Embin oil fields, the construction of the Petropavlovsk-Kokchetav railroad, the accomplishments of the Aral fishermen, and the first agricultural communes. He discussed the problems of central Asia and Kazakhstan in many of his works, perspicaciously determining their brilliant future and place in the country's economic potential. He elaborated a program for radical socio-cultural changes. That is why, becoming the area of the virgin land and space exploits of the Soviet people, the Soviet East is justifiably known as the land where Lenin's ideas were implemented.

In the years which followed the Great October Revolution a distance was covered from wooden plows to powerful tractors, complex modern equipment and the Baykonur spacedrome, from forgotten villages to bright socialist cities, and from nearly total illiteracy to national academies of sciences, and hundreds of scientific research institutes and establishments working on a broad range of problems ranging from the microworld to outer space. Could our republics achieve this alone? No, and once again, no. Real blossoming and the spiritual and social renaissance of the peoples are achieved not through national exclusivity and separation but as a result of joint and reciprocal efforts to build a new life, happy and free, imbued with the spirit of true innovation, creativity, and unparalleled dynamism.

The scope and scale of the accomplishments may be judged by the following data: this year the volume of industrial output in Kazakhstan will be over 220 times the prerevolutionary level, and nearly 30 times the level of the prewar 1940. The indicators of others among our republics are similar. Slightly over 50 years ago central Asia and Kazakhstan imported nearly all their industrial goods. Matters are different today, when a great variety of goods is exported from here to tens of countries in the world, including the most economically developed capitalist states.

In the past 5-year period Kazakhstan alone built 365 big plants and shops equipped according to the latest word of the scientific and technical revolution. Once remote areas are converting into developed industrial centers. It took only a few years for Mangyshlak, the previously desert peninsula where the great poet Shevchenko was sent to exile by the tsar in the past, to reach the level of the leading areas of the country in petroleum and gas extraction. The first big fast neutron reactor in the world, the champion of the republic's nuclear power industry, is operating in Mangyshlak.

Our entire country is happy with the successes of the petroleum workers of Mangyshlak and Gur'yev, the metallurgical workers of Dzhezkazgan and Ust'-Kamenogorsk, the tractor builders of Pavlodar, the ferroalloy smelters of Yermak, the chemical workers of Dzhambul and Chimkent, and the miners of East Kazakhstan and the Kustanay area which is the iron ore base of the Kazakhstan Magnitka and of the southern Urals. Previously the country had three coal stokeholds--Donbass, Kuzbass, and Karaganda. A fourth has now appeared in Kazakhstan: the intensive open pit coal extraction at the gigantic cuts of Ekibastuz which is contributing to the accelerated development of this unique industrial-energy center.

Radical changes have taken place in agriculture as well. Primitive nomad and seminomad farming has been replaced by big multisectorial sovkhoses and kolkhozes equipped with modern technology. The heroic epic of the development of the virgin and fallow lands, when the Kazakhstan party organization was headed by L. I. Brezhnev, is one of the most glorious pages in the chronicles of the great Soviet people. Hundreds of thousands of volunteer patriots from other fraternal republics came to the Kazakhstan virgin land. Its development became a sort of "experimental field" in which not only the strength of the machines but of the character of the Soviet people was tested. The fraternal friendship among our peoples opened its powerful wings over the awakened Kazakh steppes and yielded outstanding results. However, the power of the virgin land lies not only in the first-grade grain it grows but in the radical reorganization of the economy of all of today's 19 Kazakhstan oblasts where members of over 100 nations and nationalities are inspiredly working hand in hand in a united single family.

The advantages of the socialist system and the high level of development of production forces reached made it possible to improve substantially the prosperity of the working people. Housing and sociocultural construction was developed extensively. In the past 5-year period one out of four residents of Kazakhstan moved into new premises. As in all fraternal republics the task of tremendously upgrading the cultural standard, formulated by Lenin in the very first years of the Soviet system, has been successfully implemented in Kazakhstan. Accessibility to all types of education, scholarships to VUZ and technical school students, development of correspondence training, a broad political education network and universal economic training and facilities for upgrading skills enable us to say that in our republic practically every second person is going to school.

The victory of the real cultural revolution in central Asia and Kazakhstan and the blossoming of their national cultures are the result of the bold socioeconomic changes made under the party's leadership. They are the result of the policy of equality and friendship among peoples and of their indivisible fraternity in the course of which the culture of one nation does not suppress the culture of another but, interacting with it, actively enriches itself and, in turn, gives to the other fraternal culture its best. As a result of such a process a generous reciprocal enrichment takes place, exceptionally fruitful in terms of the development of overall Soviet culture.

Life offers extensive data backing the conclusion that the development of the economy, science, and culture of each of the republics, and their closest possible ties within a single all-union complex are actively contributing to the further all-round development of the Soviet people as a basically new historical community.

The 10th Five-Year Plan, whose tasks were formulated by the historical 25th CPSU Congress, offers to the country and to each separate republic new and even broader horizons and great possibilities. In Kazakhstan alone the volume of industrial output will increase 40 percent compared with the past

five-year plan. The role of the republic will become even bigger as one of the basic granaries of the Soviet Union and as the biggest livestock base of the country. The current five-year plan calls for a further considerable growth of the economy and comprehensive development of all union republics and for improvements in the location of production forces.

The 10th Five-Year Plan marks a new stage in the implementation of the Leninist national policy. "As always," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "the five-year plan for the development of the economy of the Soviet Union takes into consideration the specific characteristics and requirements of each union and autonomous republic, insuring their harmonious development and general upsurge toward new heights of social progress. Our five-year plan is a Leninist policy of friendship among peoples translated into the language of economics."

Naturally, speaking of our achievements and plans, we are far from the idea of presenting our accomplishments exclusively in an ideal light. We still have difficulties and problems. Most of them, however, are problems of growth, so to speak, and shall be unquestionably resolved by us jointly. Every passing day proves that the party's plans will be implemented. This is guaranteed by the inspired work done at all sectors of economic and cultural construction and the lofty feeling of responsibility and self-criticism born out of the entire Soviet way of life, one of whose most important components is the friendship and fraternity among the peoples of our great and united country.

The experience of Kazakhstan and the republics of Central Asia convincingly proves, again and again, that it is only under socialism that a true blossoming of the national economy and culture could be achieved within a short time. That is why this experience exerts a tremendous attraction to many peoples, including those who have only recently cast away the colonial yoke.

Our republics generously share their experience. They actively participate in the economic, scientific and technical, and cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and foreign countries. The scale of such exchanges are eloquently proved by the fact that today the Kazakh SSR maintains economic relations with 80 foreign countries and cultural relations with 96 foreign countries. The children and grandchildren of yesterday's nomads are today giving skilled scientific and technical assistance to the peoples of many countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The activities of social organizations such as the Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, the Committee of Youth Organizations, and the Committees for Solidarity and Defense of the Peace are directed toward strengthening the friendship, trust, and reciprocal understanding among nations.

Interest in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and in their culture is vividly manifested in important events promoted abroad: Soviet Union days and weeks, involving the participation of noted masters of the national arts, and the sponsoring of graphics, painting, and applied art exhibits.

The best works of contemporary writers from the Soviet East are confidently gaining union and worldwide fame. The increased interest in our life is manifested also in the sponsoring in our country of international meetings, symposiums, and seminars along the lines of CEMA, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and scientific organizations, involving the participation of foreign societies and associations for friendship with the USSR.

Like all Soviet people, expressing their firm and unanimous support of the appeal of the World Peace Council for an end to the arms race and for making detente irreversible, the people of Kazakhstan have signed the new Stockholm Appeal. Virtually the entire adult population of Kazakhstan--9.3 million people--has signed the appeal. This is yet another unquestionable confirmation of the warm desire of the Soviet people to protect and strengthen peace throughout the world and to insure the safety of the nations.

All these and many other facts convincingly prove that the noble struggle waged by the CPSU for a lasting peace on earth and friendship and cooperation among the peoples is unanimously approved and supported by the Soviet people who have infinite faith in their own party whose historical experience in this responsible area enables it to act competently and, as reality has proved, highly effectively.

III

The Great October Revolution marked the beginning of a radical change in the entire system of international relations. Starting with 1917 the era of total imperialist domination was replaced by the era of struggle and competition between socialism and capitalism. The foreign policy of the first socialist state in the world continues to play a tremendous role in the still-continuing changes in international relations. This policy is most directly linked with the great Lenin and with his fellow workers and students. Its basic principles were, and remain, proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

On the very second day of the revolution the Leninist policy of peace and friendship among peoples was proclaimed throughout the planet. "...The struggle for peace," V. I. Lenin said, "is beginning. This struggle will be difficult and adamant. International imperialism is mobilizing all its forces against us..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 35, p 86).

The path we have followed since the October Revolution has been marked by a tireless struggle waged by the CPSU and the Soviet state and, subsequently, by the other ruling communist parties and fraternal countries for insuring a lasting peace among nations and against aggression and the arms race.

It cannot be said that all our peace initiatives have been always successful. No, they could not be even though they were deeply right in their time. They could not be successful since in the initial decades imperialism

was opposed only by us and fraternal Mongolia. The present socialist comity did not exist at that time. At that time we were unable to prevent World War II from breaking out.

The outcome of the war was the crushing defeat of fascism with the decisive role played by the Soviet Union. We neither wished nor could wish such a war which deprived the Soviet people of 20 million of its sons and daughters, and brought about infinite suffering and destruction. No other nation has known such sorrow as the Soviet people. The enemy was wrong. He did not take into consideration that it is impossible to defeat a people who has known true freedom, equality, and fraternity and who has gained confidence in itself and faith in the power of the new world.

The lessons of the Great Patriotic War are a stern warning to all possible amateurs of military adventures. These lessons clearly prove that any aggression against the Soviet state and its allies is doomed to inevitable failure and that the forces of socialism and democracy are invincible.

In the postwar period, following Lenin's behests, the Soviet Union headed the struggle of the immeasurably stronger forces of peace and progress for the prevention of a new world war, detente, and universal and total disarmament. The peace program formulated at the 24th CPSU Congress gained tremendous popularity throughout the globe.

It would be no exaggeration to say that that which was accomplished for the implementation of the peace program is of truly permanent historical significance. The implementation of its stipulations substantially improved the international climate and stimulated economic, cultural, and scientific and technical cooperation. The positions of the socialist countries grew stronger and the beneficial influence of their international policy increased. Detente became a leading trend. All this convincingly confirms the profoundly scientific approach taken by our party toward international affairs, its realism in the assessment of current events, and its optimistic confidence in the future.

Launching a peaceful offensive, at its 25th congress the party adopted a program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples. As the organic extension and development of the peace program, the new program covers a set of most important priority measures and proposals dictated by the need to struggle further for peace and socialism and for the peaceful future of mankind.

The prospects for the development of the detente process itself are determined at the present stage above all by the fact that it is based on objective historical laws. The concentrated expression of these laws is found in the radical and irreversible nature of the changed ratio of forces between the two socioeconomic systems in favor of socialism.

The first half of the 1970's was marked by the further expansion and consolidation of the all-round cooperation between the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries, the strengthening of their comity, and their confident aggressive progress toward developed socialism and communism.

For over 30 years the world socialist system has been an international force determining, to an ever-greater extent, the course of the world's development. Socialist revolutions were made in a number of European and Asian countries and, subsequently, in the Western Hemisphere--in Cuba. The victory of the Vietnamese people after many years of courageous struggle against the aggressors was of tremendous and truly historical significance.

The establishment of the world socialist system is inseparable from the victory of the Great October Revolution, the existence and successes of the first socialist country in the world, the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, and the growth of our economic power. The words of L. I. Brezhnev on the significance of the unity of the socialist countries as the most important prerequisite for the successes achieved by world socialism, delivered from the rostrum of the 25th CPSU Congress, were particularly emphatic: "Thanks to the unity, solidarity, and mutual support of the socialist countries, in the past 5-year period they were able to resolve very big problems and achieve targets for which they had long struggled." The very basis of this unity and its heart and guiding and organizing force is the unbreakable combat alliance among ruling communist parties and the unity of their outlooks and objectives.

The economic upsurge of the socialist countries is inseparably linked with their intensive economic cooperation on a bilateral and multilateral basis developing in accordance with internationalist principles. Today our comity is resolving problems aimed at intensifying the international socialist division of labor, the extensive development of international specialization of national production facilities, and the development of new and even more effective methods for reciprocal economic relations.

Within a historically short time the area covered by CEMA has become the most dynamic industrial zone in the world. In the past 5 years the industry of its member countries grew 400 percent faster than that of the developed capitalist states. In 1975 the CEMA-member countries' industrial output was 2.5 times higher than that of the Common Market countries. The dynamic development of the CEMA-member countries and the steadfast upsurge of the prosperity of the working people convincingly prove the superiority of the socialist type of international relations.

While crises are buffeting the capitalist economy, the socialist comity is continuing its steadfast progress, jointly resolving even the most complex problems.

Foreign policy coordination has become an important factor in increasing the unity and solidarity of the members of the socialist comity. Thanks to such coordination they are exerting an ever more effective impact on processes and

trends in international life. Their joint actions in the world arena enable them to successfully resolve important problems related to the consolidation of the international positions and the defense of the interests of each socialist state and of world socialism at large.

Socialism has reached the types of levels at which its gains have become irreversible. In the course of its consolidation the realm of action of capitalism in the world arena continues to narrow. Under the influence of the ideas of the October Revolution and thanks to the support provided by existing socialism, the peoples of former colonies and semicolonies gained their freedom and independence. Recently we witnessed the total breakdown of the imperialist colonial system and the fall of the last colonial empire--that of Portugal.

The scale and intensiveness of foreign policy coordination among the members of the socialist comity, the level of their unity and, respectively, the effectiveness of their measures are unparalleled in the history of world politics. Socialism not only introduced new norms and principles in international relations but proved the unprecedented opportunities offered by its class policy consistent with the interests and expectations of the peoples, a policy which leads to the democratization of the system of international relations and is having an ever-greater influence on the contemporary world.

Guided by the decisions of its 25th congress, the party is systematically promoting the further all-round strengthening of the unity among the fraternal socialist states, the development of their all-round interaction, and the growth of their joint contribution to the struggle for strengthening the peace and security and international cooperation.

It was asserted at the 25th CPSU Congress that the Soviet Union is ready to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China which, as we know, began to worsen since the beginning of the 1960's not by the fault of the Soviet side. It is worth noting that in its desire to undermine detente, imperialist reaction is relying ever more openly on Peking's anti-Sovietism while Peking, in turn, is promoting it itself. Such a course hardly promises anything good to the Chinese people who face a number of unresolved problems demanding intensive work and good neighborly relations with other peoples and states.

Formulating a revolutionary strategy, Lenin indicated above all two most important aspects of this matter. The main lever with which socialism influences the world's revolutionary process is its economic policy, the creation of a technical and economic base for the new system insuring a level of development of production forces and material prosperity and culture of the working people higher than under capitalism. The other aspect is "support of the revolutionary movement of the socialist proletariat in advanced countries...support of the democratic and revolutionary movement in all countries, particularly in colonial and dependent ones" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 76).

These principles are being implemented steadfastly and systematically by our party and by all Marxists-Leninists. Existing socialism is encouraging the further development of revolutionary processes in other parts of the world but not at all through the infamous "export of revolution" as bourgeois propaganda is slanderously trying to depict it. The main weapon of socialism is the power of its example, its ever-clearer superiority over capitalism.

IV

The Great October Revolution had a decisive influence on the destinies of mankind. The merger of the national liberation movement with the struggle waged by the working class within a single revolutionary stream became the characteristic feature of the world's development in the past 60 years.

Following Lenin's behests our party has invariably paid its closest possible attention to problems of national liberation and international solidarity with the struggling peoples. In present-day circumstances the Leninist analysis of the social direction followed by the national liberation struggle becomes particularly important.

Addressing the Third Comintern Congress, Lenin expressed his confidence that "In the future decisive battles of the world's revolution, the movement of the majority of the population on earth, initially directed toward national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and, perhaps, will play a far greater revolutionary role than we expect" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 38).

This is precisely what is happening. Today the struggle no longer for merely national but social liberation is assuming increasingly obvious priority. The alliance between world socialism and the national liberation movement, the possibility for which was indicated by Lenin, serves the solution of vitally important problems of world development in the interests of all mankind, while accelerating the revolutionary process.

The Soviet Union expresses its solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who are waging a just struggle for the strengthening of their political and economic independence and for social progress. The USSR has invariably opposed the imperialist policy of interference in the domestic affairs of the peoples of these continents and supported the anti-imperialist trend of the foreign political course taken by the young sovereign countries. "We have always considered," L. I. Brezhnev emphasizes, "it our firm obligation, stemming from our communist convictions and our socialist morality, to give the broadest possible support to the peoples fighting for the right cause of freedom. Such has always been the case and such will be the case in the future."

The years of courageous struggle waged by the peoples of Indochina against imperialist aggression, the struggle of the people of Angola against neo-colonialist expansion, the victory of the antifeudal national democratic

revolution in Ethiopia, and other events in the realm of the national liberation struggle waged recently have provided abundant proof of the loyalty of our party to its international duty.

The Leninist approach of the CPSU to the problems of the interdependence between the struggle for peace and for national liberation of the peoples is inseparable from the firm exposure of the attempts of imperialist reaction to divide the socialist from the developing countries and deprive the national liberation movement of its anti-imperialist direction.

The conclusions of the 25th CPSU Congress on the correlation between the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress are of most topical practical and scientific-theoretical significance. The problem of the correlation of detente with social progress is a constituent part of the basic problem of the correlation between revolution and peace. In his time Lenin provided its basic solution. In terms of the present the position of our party on this account was clearly expressed at its 25th congress and in L. I. Brezhnev's articles and speeches.

The movement for peace, democracy, and socialism merges with the struggle for national liberation and with the class battles against monopoly capital and reaction. Detente is influencing the ratio of sociopolitical forces in the capitalist countries, undermining the positions of imperialism, neo-colonialism, and racism while, conversely, intensifying the influence of the working people and of progressive revolutionary forces, above all the proletariat and its class organizations. The working class is gaining new possibilities for the further assertion of its leading role in the struggle for the vital interests of the working people and for basic national interests.

Reality proves that in our time peace is indivisible from security. Detente is equally needed by all countries regardless of their social system. No nation needs a world war. All countries benefit from detente. Detente will remain a vitally necessary task in contemporary international relations.

Naturally, subjective factors cannot fail to influence the course of detente. We know, in particular, the negative impact on the pace of development of this process of certain actions launched by the American leadership contradicting the objective requirements of the time.

One of the most urgent problems of our time is the consolidation and multiplication of anything achieved through detente and its materialization. The main direction here, as indicated at the 25th CPSU Congress, is the struggle for adding military detente to political detente, for putting an end to the arms race, and for disarmament.

We know that the appeal to turn swords into plowshares has been heard over many centuries. However, turning it into a practical slogan and into practice became possible only in our time, when socialism has become a decisive factor of social development.

Detente cannot remain the privilege of a single area or continent. The logic of history demands its comprehensive extension.

The desire of the Soviet people to support any realistic step in the creation of a lasting system of international security on the basis of the joint efforts of Asian countries was expressed by L. I. Brezhnev in Alma-Ata, the capital of Kazakhstan. The need to develop detente on the Asian continent is more than obvious, for a great deal of explosive materials have piled up here in the past. Bloody wars have raged here. Imperialist military bases remain here. No less than Europe, Asia needs detente and its peoples must find their path to peace and security.

The USSR is building relations with its Asian neighbors on the basis of principles which factually contribute to strengthening the peace on the Asian continent and the trust among nations, and the development of their all-round cooperation. Such friendly relations have long developed between us and India, for example, based on objective historical factors and the national interests of our peoples. We consider this as a permanent basic policy fully consistent with the spirit of the times.

Detente should and could be stronger and more reliable were it to become universal, covering Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Implementing the Leninist foreign policy, the CPSU and the Soviet state take into consideration that the path to lasting peace is not simple. The cause of peace has not only supporters but active opponents as well. They consist, above all, of forces which are trying to build their policy on anticommunist and anti-Soviet propaganda. The opponents of detente are engaged not only in verbal battles in an effort to eliminate from the dictionary the very word "detente," but in realms more important than philology. Currently they are hastening to regroup their forces and are seeking new allies in order to jointly wreck the implementation of the Final Act of the European conference in Helsinki and to torpedo or, at least, hinder detente and prevent the consolidation of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international life. Hiding behind demagogic phrases of peace and disarmament, they are trying to gain unilateral military advantages and open the gates to a new stage in the arms race.

The forces of the military-industrial complex, the Zionist organizations, the Maoists, the most inveterate racists, extreme right wingers, fascists and neofascists are acting together as the extreme reaction. In an effort to hinder and, if possible, turn back the process of detente, international reaction is engaged in a coordinated offensive against the policy of peace and its accomplishments. Here it relies particularly on the dissemination of the false thesis of the allegedly growing "Soviet military threat," and on various types of ideological subversions.

One such subversion is the hysterical campaign launched in the capitalist West on an unparalleled scale on the subject of the "violation of human rights" in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This campaign is being waged particularly fiercely in countries which are trying to distract the attention of the public from the imperialist policy of social, racial, and national oppression.

Firmly rebuffing the intrigues of the enemies of peace and socialism, the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are purposefully promoting the further development of changes in international circumstances favorable to the cause of peace and social progress. The position of our party is principled and inviolable. It is not circumstantial but permanent, for this is the only way possible for defending the sacred cause of the peace and true social progress for the sake of the happiness of the great Soviet people and of all honest people on earth.

As was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress detente does not mean in the least any rapprochement or reconciliation between bourgeois and communist ideologies. As stated in the party's Central Committee Accountability Report to the congress, detente and peaceful coexistence apply to intergovernmental relations. This means, above all, that arguments and conflicts between countries must not be resolved through the use of force or the threat of force.

Through the refined methods of nationalistic propaganda, imperialist reaction is trying to hinder the further development of the socialist comity. Anti-communism has focused its main efforts on distorting the history of the October Revolution, trying to present the greatest event of the century as an accidental "purely Russian" phenomenon, and so on. The tremendous socio-economic changes which have taken place in Kazakhstan and Central Asia are depicted as a continuation of the tsarist Russification policy.

The "sovietologists" are trying to distort the nature of relations between the peoples of our country. They slander the experience of the successful solution of the national problem in the USSR in an effort to discredit it among the peoples of the world and thus to hinder the liberation movement, including the struggle for the solution of the national problem in developed capitalist countries. However, all imperialist attempts--open and concealed--are futile. Socialism is having an ever-growing influence on the minds and hearts of hundreds of millions of people on earth. Unquestionably, the future will provide new proof of the infinite possibilities of socialism and of its historical superiority over capitalism.

In our days there is no force which could turn back the legitimate process of the renovation of social life. The popular masses are trying the change the world and they will change it. Firmly supporting the forces of social progress, the CPSU, the Soviet state, and the entire Soviet people openly express their solidarity with their class brothers fighting in foreign countries and with the liberation movements. This does not conflict in the

least with the steadfast struggle for peace, equality, and mutually profitable cooperation among countries with different social systems promoted by our party and state.

The achievements of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the struggle for peace, security, and social progress are the legitimate results of the toil of the entire Soviet people. This is understandable, for the successes of Soviet foreign policy are inseparably linked with a successful domestic policy, and with the growth of our economic, scientific and technical, and defense potential, the development of culture, and the sociopolitical and ideological unity of Soviet society.

The Leninist foreign policy principles and the systematically peaceful course pursued by our party were vividly reasserted in the convincing report submitted by L. I. Brezhnev at the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This report provided a Marxist-Leninist substantiation of the need for the adoption of a new constitution. It indicated comprehensively the tremendous changes which have taken place in the Soviet society and the world at large and brought to light the historical significance of the fundamental law of the Soviet state to the domestic life of the country and to international progress. Once again Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Constitutional Commission, revealed himself to the entire world as a systematic and principled fighter for peace and for the happiness of the working people, and as a realistic and purposeful builder of new international relations.

Each word and action of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and now also chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium--a position to which L. I. Brezhnev was unanimously elected by the representatives of the Soviet people to the supreme organ of our state--is backed by the strength of the prestige of the great Leninist party and the power of our socialist homeland. This strength and power are continuing to grow, contributing to the further strengthening of the international positions of the Soviet state. This is a matter not only of politicians and diplomats but of the entire party, of all working people in our boundless fatherland.

Only months separate us from the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution--the main event of the 20th century. As throughout the country, extensive work is being done in Soviet Kazakhstan to be ready for this greatest of holidays of the multinational and united Soviet people. Preparations for the great anniversary are taking place under the influence of the ideas and decisions of the historical 25th party congress, and in the effective rhythm of the implementation of the five-year effectiveness and quality plan. We began the five-year plan properly. The multisectorial economy, science, and culture of Kazakhstan are in a new state of upsurge.

The working people of Soviet Kazakhstan are steadily strengthening their friendship and mutual aid with the working people of the fraternal republics. The all-union socialist competition for the successful fulfillment

and overfulfillment of the assignments of the anniversary year and of the 10th Five-Year Plan as a whole is enriching our creative cooperation through reciprocal experience. It is upgrading effectiveness and quality in many sectors of economic and cultural construction.

Today the people of Kazakhstan are working with tremendous enthusiasm in an atmosphere of revolutionary optimism within the fraternal family of peoples, creatively embodying the plans of the great Lenin. Thus, like all other Soviet people, they are proving with new emphasis their indestructible moral and political unity, loyalty to Marxist-Leninist ideals, and great constructive force of socialist internationalism, as well as their monolithic unity around their own party and its Leninist Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo headed by Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev.

The people of Kazakhstan, like the entire Soviet people, are answering with their actions the tremendous concern and attention paid by our party to topical problems of the further strengthening of the peace and friendship among nations. Such concern and attention demand of us a great deal. Above all, we must always justify the great trust of Lenin's party, confidently leading the Soviet people to new historical victories in everything.

5003

CSO: 1802

PROBLEM OF THE MAJORITY IN THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 33-44

[Article by Yu. Krasin, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] Inaugurating the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, the Great October Socialist Revolution became the source of experience in the victorious seizure of power by the working class. On the basis of this experience several generations of communists and revolutionaries interpreted the problems and difficulties encountered by the socialist revolution and studied the principles governing the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary vanguard. To this day the 60-year old events are a source of revolutionary inspiration for all Marxists-Leninists, and of live international experience which manifested the laws governing the socialist revolution and which, therefore, help to resolve the complex political and theoretical problems of our time.

V. I. Lenin indicated the "historical inevitability of repeating on an international scale" several basic features of our revolution (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 41, p 3). Lenin's conclusion has been confirmed by all subsequent social practice. The historical experience of world socialism, states the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," "irrefutably proved the universal significance of the basic laws of the socialist revolution and of the building of a new society discovered by the science of Marxism-Leninism and embodied for the first time in the practice of the October Revolution. It proved the need for a creative application of these laws in accordance with the specific conditions and characteristics of the individual countries." The experience of the October Revolution and Lenin's ideological heritage provide the basic theoretical and methodological system of coordinates outside of which a search for a solution to contemporary revolutionary problems is doomed to fruitless rambling inevitably accompanied by major errors and heavy losses to the working class and its allies.

Together with the experience of other revolutions, the historical experience of the Great October Revolution vividly revealed the basic laws

governing the shaping of mass revolutionary forces. "The Bolsheviks," said L. I. Brezhnev in the report "Fifty Years of Great Victories of Socialism," "have always proceeded from the fact that the socialist revolution is not a coup d'etat by the leadership. It is not a conspiracy of a group of heroes but a movement of the broadest toiling masses. Always in the thick of the masses, and heading their struggle, the party was able to rally millions of workers, peasants, and soldiers within the single army of the revolution."

We would be fully justified in saying that the study of this experience, its comparison with contemporary revolutionary experience, the establishment of the common laws of the shaping of the mass forces of the socialist revolution around the political vanguard of the working class, and the creative interpretation of the common principles of the Leninist strategy of broad class and political alliances are today of primary importance to the activities of Marxist-Leninist parties. This is a central problem in preparing the subjective factor of the socialist revolution. The topicality of this problem is also determined by the fact that it is a subject not only of theory but of practical politics. The molding of the mass revolutionary forces is a sociopolitical process with its objective laws which are the subject of scientific study and theory. At the same time, the molding of mass revolutionary forces is the objective and result of the active efforts of the political vanguard of the working class in the capitalist countries. The efforts of the communist parties which, relying on Marxist-Leninist theory, are implementing the principles of the strategy of class and political alliances, are directed toward the solution of this most important political problem. The theoretical and political aspects of the problem are organically interlinked in their activities. This means that theoretical clarity concerning the composition of revolutionary forces, their interrelationships, and their potential possibilities, and changes in their structure, political behavior, and trends followed in their regrouping in the course of the struggle constitute a necessary prerequisite for the elaboration of political programs consistent with the circumstances and requirements of the workers movement and the elaboration of a political course toward unity among left-wing and democratic forces.

The topic of the establishment of mass revolutionary forces covers a very broad range of problems. They include the study of the objective situation and the evolution of classes and social strata which could become the motive forces of a socialist revolution; the structure and ways of unification of class alliances between the proletariat and the political blocs of left-wing and democratic forces; and problems of interrelationship between Marxist-Leninist parties and the broad masses. All these facets and aspects of the complex process of the establishment of mass revolutionary forces were clearly manifested in the period of preparations for and making of the October Revolution. They were comprehensively interpreted in Lenin's ideological heritage which summed up the international experience of the revolutionary epoch initiated by the revolution and were embodied in the strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party.

Naturally, starting with October 1917, the conditions for a revolutionary movement on a worldwide scale as well as in individual capitalist countries have been changing continuously and are substantially different today. Nevertheless, suffice it to consider the lessons of the Chilean revolution, the logic of development of the Portuguese revolution, and the experience of tense class and interparty relations in other capitalist countries to see the common nature of some basic problems and laws governing the shaping of mass sociopolitical forces in the revolutionary movement today. Naturally, such problems and laws are manifested each time in specific aspects always marked by the unique characteristics related to time and place. This shows that revolutionary experience can never be mechanically transferred from one historical ground to another; it needs a creative interpretation in accordance with existing changes. Such an approach proves to us that the ideas and experience of the October Revolution are still "operative" and help the communists to analyze problems of the revolutionary process and develop creatively Marxist-Leninist theory and practical policy.

Of late one of the questions related to the development of mass revolutionary forces has been actively discussed within the communist movement. It is the question of the majority in the revolution, and of the role of this majority in the seizure of the power by the working class. It is not the purpose of this article to analyze the various viewpoints expressed on this matter. It will be limited to a consideration of some factual problems of winning over the people's majority on the side of the socialist revolution which have emerged in the course of the discussions. These problems faced the Russian working class and the Leninist party in 1917; in a particular aspect, differently, they face today the working class and the communist parties of the countries in the capitalist world. We believe that within the framework of such a broad comparison of viewpoints and experience of different parties, the need for which was mentioned by L. I. Brezhnev at the Berlin forum of European communists, it would be useful to consider the question of the majority from the viewpoint of the historical experience of the October Revolution.

The initial postulate in formulating the question of the majority in the socialist revolution is the familiar Marxist thesis of the decisive significance of the material force in the implementation of profound social changes. "...Great historical problems," Lenin noted, "are resolved, in the final account, by force alone..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 10, p 313). Such a force should not be given a vulgar interpretation as being a physical influence, direct coercion, and so on. It is a question of other, specifically political values. The material force needed for the solution of the problem of power in the socialist revolution is insured by the participation of the broadest possible toiling masses and the sympathy and support of the tremendous majority of the people. Both right-wing and left-wing opportunists ignore this common law of the socialist revolution. In the first case this inevitably leads to "parliamentary cretinism," or the naive conviction that the problem of power could be resolved merely by voting and various parliamentary combinations. In the second case leftist

adventurism, the aspiration to see the power through the efforts of an active minority are inevitable. Fighting right-wing opportunistic and anarchic and adventuristic concepts, the founders of Marxism-Leninism always considered the socialist revolution a revolution of the tremendous majority headed by the working class and on behalf of the interests of the majority. The tremendous nature of the tasks and depth of the socialist revolution require the conscious participation of the broadest possible popular masses in it. "The time of sudden attacks, of revolutions made by a small conscious minority heading unconscious masses, is past," F. Engels wrote. "Wherever it is a question of the total reorganization of the social system the masses themselves must participate. They themselves must understand the purpose of the struggle and the purpose for which they are shedding blood and sacrificing lives" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], Vol 22, p 544). Developing this thought Lenin wrote that the socialist revolution could be successfully accomplished only with the independent historical creativity of the population's majority, and, above all, by the majority of the working people (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 171).

This majority principle, if we could so describe it, fully applies to the question of power in the socialist revolution. The support and sympathy of the popular majority is a necessary prerequisite enabling the progressive class to keep the power. That is why Lenin firmly opposed adventuristic attempts to seize the power by a revolutionary vanguard without majority support. "We do not wish a 'seizure' of power," he emphasized, "since all revolutionary experience teaches us that the only solid power is the one based on the majority of the population. That is why the 'seizure' of power would be an adventure and our party would not go for it. If a government is a government of the majority it may pursue a policy which may seem erroneous at first. However, no other solution is possible" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 99). The concluding words of this sentence emphasize with full clarity that Lenin did not allow for any alternative to power by the majority. Even if a majority government, relying on a broad, even though socially and politically heterogeneous mass base, may not become immediately systematically revolutionary, and even if initially it may pursue a wrong line, nevertheless the only path open to the revolutionary vanguard of the working class to power is the path to be followed together with the majority.

The opponents of Leninism created the ideological myth of the "seizure" of power by the Bolsheviks in October 1917 allegedly not based on the will of the majority. In reality, the seizure of power by the working class in Russia was the logical consequence of a complex regrouping of socio-class forces in the country completed with the conversion of the tremendous majority of working people to the side of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, the side of the Leninist party. A profound study of these processes is found in Lenin's works among which we could single out "Will the Bolsheviks Retain the State Power?" The conclusion based on this analysis stated that in terms of the key problems on the agenda "already now the Bolsheviks have the majority in the soviets of workers,

soldiers, and peasant deputies, the majority of the people, and the majority of the petite bourgeoisie" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, p 298). Addressing the 10 October 1917 meeting of the RSDWP(b) Central Committee, Lenin noted that "Now the majority is for us. Politically matters are entirely ripe for a power transition" (Ibid., p 391).

As we may see, Lenin's formulation of the matter is based on the fact that the seizure of the power by the working class always presumes, regardless of the method used to accomplish it, the winning over of the popular majority. However, the "majority" and "minority" categories by themselves are too general and abstract to enable us to bring to light the complex mechanism of the seizure of power in a socialist revolution. The very fact that the term "majority" is accompanied by numerous epithets ("formal," "political," "mathematical," "active," "passive," and so on) shows that this concept is far from simple. The abstract use of the concept of majority, in fact, represents a departure from a specific historical analysis of the problem in its entire complexity and contradictoriness and from the consideration of the socio-class composition of the political forces which could and should resolve the problem of power in accordance with the regrouping of such forces in the course of revolutionary development. The "majority" is not some sort of static and homogeneous value. In a revolution the majority is a rather complex and dynamic structure. The Marxist study of the problem of majority demands a comprehensive approach. It is important to encompass in their totality all main aspects and facets of this concept. Its specific socio-class analysis is always necessary in accordance with the nature of the revolution, the stage reached in its development, and the interests and positions of classes, social strata, and political parties which participate in it. Each majority has different and frequently heterogeneous elements in terms of class characteristics, extent of requirements, and level of sociopolitical activeness.

In the class society the revolutionary majority develops as a system of alliances between the proletariat and the nonproletarian toiling strata. In Russia this was, above all, an alliance between the working class and the peasantry. At the present stage in developed capitalist countries a popular majority presumes the alliance between the working class not only with the peasantry but with the urban petite bourgeoisie, the progressive intelligentsia, and the middle classes. Understandably, by the virtue of the socio-class heterogeneity of the allies, the volume and content of interests and requirements of the working class and of the nonproletarian toiling strata do not fully coincide (substantial differences exist in this respect even among the different working class categories). Naturally, the socialist objectives and requirements cannot immediately become the basic platform for the unification of the majority of the people even though essentially they are consistent with the basic interests of all working people, i.e., of the tremendous majority.

The point is that the masses--Lenin considered this the basic law of the revolution--are becoming aware of political objectives through their own

political experience gained in the struggle for the solution of general democratic problems which have become ripe and understandable by the majority of the people. The way to the final objectives passes through the type of intermediary objectives which rally the majority. The intention to rally the majority immediately on a purely socialist platform could lead to sectarianism and to the exclusion from the revolutionary movement of forces (the urban and rural petite bourgeoisie) which, by virtue of their position, are unable to fight immediately for socialism but reach it after a long and difficult trip, surmounting doubts and hesitations in the course of their practical training. The entire importance of involving such strata in the revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the proletariat is particularly clear in the light of the lessons of the Chilean revolution.

Stemming from the abstraction of a "pure" socialist revolution, in which only two antagonistic classes--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat--confront each other, with certain stipulations we could imagine that the working class could seize the power on the basis of a purely socialist platform. However, as Lenin repeatedly emphasized, such "pure" revolutions neither exist nor could exist. Consequently, at each stage in the ripening and development of the socialist revolution, the people's majority develops, to one or another extent, on the basis of a political compromise platform which takes into consideration the level of the factual conscious mass allies of the working class, reflecting their position, and the experience of democratic demands. This is a general law clearly manifested in all socialist revolutions made so far. In October 1917 the Bolshevik Party drew to the side of the working class the tremendous majority of the people on the basis of a compromise with the entire peasantry, on the basis of the adoption and implementation of a general democratic platform. "At the very moment of the October coup," Lenin noted, "we made not a formal but a very important (and very successful) political bloc with the peasant petite bourgeoisie, adopting in its entirety, without a single change, the Eser program, i.e., we made an unquestionable compromise to prove to the peasants that we wished an agreement with them rather than to make them the majority" (Poln. Sobr. Soch., Vol 41, p 57). In the October Revolution the majority of the people were on the side of the working class, for the political experience of the masses gained between February and October 1917 had convinced them that the revolutionary proletariat alone was able to meet the vital requirements: bring peace, give land, and put an end to national oppression. At the time of the seizure of power the working class in Russia had on its side the tremendous majority, for its struggle for socialist objectives merged within a single stream with the nationwide desire for peace and with the general democratic peasant movement against the heritage of serfdom, as well as the struggle waged by the peoples of the national outlying areas of the country for their liberation. As to the purely socialist objectives, on this matter the revolutionary proletariat could rely initially only on the alliance with the poorest peasantry. The experience of the October Revolution proves that the shaping of mass revolutionary forces is hardly a straight-line process. It has different dimensions and different sections. That is why the very concept of majority is frequently ascribed different meanings. Obviously, this is the key to the

fact that in some cases Lenin spoke of the support of the tremendous majority of the people for the seizure of power by the working class in October 1917, while noting elsewhere that there was no such majority on the side of the working class prior to the seizure of power. "...the proletariat has on its side the sympathy of the majority of the people," he wrote at the end of September 1917 ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, p 300). "...the proletariat," he pointed out in December 1919, referring, in particular, to the experience of the Russian revolution, "must begin by overthrowing the bourgeoisie and seizing the power and then using this power, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the weapon of its class with a view to gaining the sympathy of the majority of the working people" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 12). What is this? Is it a contradiction or a revision of a previous conclusion? Not at all. Lenin considered the term "majority" on two different levels. In the first case it was the working class plus its democratic allies (the entire peasantry), insuring it nationwide sympathy, for the October Revolution also resolved ripe general democratic problems. In the second case it was a question of developing a stable majority which would form the social base of a socialist type of power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This heterogeneous popular majority supporting the October Revolution for a variety of reasons (alliance between the working class and the entire peasantry on the platform of general democratic objectives and the alliance between the working class and the poorest peasantry on the basis of a socialist platform) also influenced the results of the November elections for a constituent assembly at which, as we know, the Bolshevik Party did not gain the majority. This fact is explained by a number of reasons whose thorough analysis enables us to see certain important characteristics of the development of the revolution in the course of which--starting with the convention of the constituent assembly--the soviets already established themselves as the political base of the state. It was precisely in the soviets that the will of the revolutionary majority was expressed. Incidentally, this revealed the distinction between the formal majority manifested with the election--bearing in mind that the election for a constituent assembly, taking place on the basis of the rules of the provisional government was not representative even from the strictly formal viewpoint--and the real majority which developed as a result of the objective logic of the interaction among mass forces motivated by their socioeconomic requirements. A factual majority develops under the essential influence of vital common interests and the requirements of the forthcoming stage of the revolutionary struggle, already mastered on the basis of personal political experience. The official demand to formulate the political positions of social forces through elections reflects differences concerning more distant objectives which a considerable share of the mass allies of the working class has not as yet adopted through personal experience.

From this viewpoint Lenin's thoughts on the dialectical understanding of the concept of the majority, expressed in his "Letter to the Comrades," written on the very eve of the October Revolution, are of great value.

Lenin mocked the pedants "who wish, at all costs, totally ignoring the factual circumstances of the revolution, to be given advance guarantees that the Bolshevik Party would garner exactly one-half of the votes plus one throughout the country. History has never offered such guarantees in any revolution and is absolutely unable to do so." He further concluded that the main thing was to establish the leading trend in the positions and behavior of mass forces. This trend was that "the majority of the people began rapidly to take the side of the Bolsheviks" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34 p 399).

Another of Lenin's thoughts expressed at that time is also important to understanding this problem. Once the conversion of the majority to the side of the working class has become a fact, the course toward the seizure of power must be followed steadfastly and consistently, regardless of fluctuations in the moods of part of the masses constituting this majority. "The mood of the masses," Lenin said, "cannot be guided, for it is fluctuating and unaccountable; we must be guided by the objective analysis and assessment of the revolution. The masses have trusted the Bolsheviks and demand of them not words but actions, a decisive policy in the struggle against the war and against the devastation" (Ibid., 394). Consequently, the majority is subjected to changes and fluctuations. Therefore, drawing a distinction between changes stemming from the objective position of the basic mass forces constituting the majority and temporary circumstantial fluctuations related to sociopsychological factors, which could be compensated for with a firm policy pursued by the revolutionary vanguard, is of essential significance.

Any popular majority is heterogeneous both in terms of its activeness and the role which its component socio-class forces play in sociopolitical life. The concept of a majority averages the positions of such heterogeneous forces, giving a common denominator to their support of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class in its struggle for power. However, the moment we raise the question of motive and extent and the moment we begin to analyze the structure of the majority we immediately see that the majority breaks down into greatly unequal groups. This includes the loose and amorphous mass of hesitating neutrals--a kind of political "swamp" which vaguely feels the need for change and which waits. The majority also includes the mass forces which sympathize with the progressive class and give it their passive support but are as yet unprepared for active struggle. The majority also includes the sociopolitical forces which, under the influence of the conditions governing their social life, actively join the struggle without realizing its objective contents and purposes or the political consequences of their actions which are spontaneous and, occasionally, even mutinous. The majority also includes the progressive detachments of the working class and its allies consciously fighting for socialist objectives. Finally, also acting within the majority is the political vanguard of the working class possessing a theoretical awareness and a scientific political program.

It is clear that the people's majority in any socialist revolution is based on complex interrelationships among heterogeneous social forces whose establishment and functioning is distinguished by its unevenness. The vanguard forces of the revolution may be rushing into battle while the main mass is still in the rear, only being awakened to the struggle. The task facing the Marxist-Leninist party in revolutionary times is to determine the will of the majority and determine the moment when it can provide maximal support to the vanguard of the working class in its struggle for power. Obviously, this cannot be accomplished simply by voting, polling, or estimating the side supported by the mathematical majority. With such a great heterogeneity of the mass forces within the revolutionary movement, it is almost certain that a vote based on formal equality would not be on the side of those who express most clearly and consistently the general progressive line of development of the majority but of those who predominate quantitatively yet who doubt, who hesitate, and who display indecision and timidity in the face of drastic changes. That is why the basic problem of the revolution, the problem of power, cannot be resolved merely on the basis of a vote. "...no single revolutionary movement," A. Gramsci justifiably pointed out, "could be decreed by a workers' national assembly..." (Antonio Gramsci, "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works], Vol 1, Moscow, 1957, p 225). In the revolutionary struggle the initiative of the progressive forces of the working class leading the masses to new battlefields of political experience and overcoming the doubts of those who hesitate is always important. Anticipating revolutionary action by a vote means dooming the workers movement to inaction. "It would be naive to await an 'official' Bolshevik majority," Lenin wrote on the eve of the October Revolution, "for no single revolution waits for this" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 34, p 241).

Yet, one must not underestimate the importance of quantitative electoral results. They could be a true indicator of the main trends in the development of the awareness and political positions of the popular majority. Going back to Lenin's work "Letter to the Comrades," it would be useful to note that the conclusion concerning the shift of the majority to the side of the Bolsheviks is based here also on mathematical computations of the results of elections to city and rayon dumas. The 20 August elections for the Petrograd City Dumas led to an increase in the probolshevik vote from 20 to 33 percent; at the September elections for rayon dumas in Moscow the percentage of votes cast for the Bolsheviks rose from 11 to 49 and 1/3 percent (a subsequent figure was about 52 percent). However, these calculations were considered by Lenin not separately but together with the other indicators of the turn of the masses toward the Bolshevik Party. Here Lenin's basic attention was focused on the characteristics of the mass movement--troubles at the fronts and peasant uprisings.

The personal political experience of the masses is of decisive significance in making the majority of the people realize that its basic interests are common with those of the working class struggling for power. Without such an experience not even the most democratic elections would be able to determine the will of this majority and rally it around the revolutionary

vanguard of the progressive class and defender of the interests of all working people. "...If the really entire class and really broad masses of working people and people oppressed by capitalism are to reach this position," Lenin wrote, "propaganda and agitation alone are insufficient. This requires the personal political experience of these masses. This is the basic law of all great revolutions..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 41, p 78). The political experience which develops a revolutionary majority is gained by the masses in the course of practical struggle whose main battlefield consists of broad mass actions, movements, and activities. Participation in voting and elections is also one of the forms of the political experience of the masses. However, in the correlation between elections and mass movements the latter always enjoy the priority in the political education of the masses. The electoral results themselves are determined by the scope and depth of the content of the mass political struggle.

In all likelihood one of the most complex problems of the peaceful seizure of power by the working class is that of creating a sufficiently stable and flexible political mechanism capable of insuring reliable ties between mass movements and the functioning of the legislatively developed bourgeois democratic system, including the electoral system. On the one hand, the political and ideological results of mass movements (changes in the social awareness of different social strata) should be strengthened through this voting mechanism within the framework of a democratic electoral system. On the other hand, electoral results positive for the working class, using that same mechanism, should gain the broad support of the mass movement and, thanks to this, acquire a real content exceeding the framework of the formal principles governing bourgeois democracy.

The shaping of a popular majority and its positions and behavior are largely determined by the activeness and initiative of the more progressive forces within this majority, forces which express and defend its basic long-range interests most consistently.

Within any popular majority, whenever it has turned to the working class yet does not possess as yet adequate political experience to launch a decisive struggle for objectively ripe targets, there are most energetic forces, one could say a politically active majority, which, through its initiative and actions lead its still-passive allies into politics, and create a basis which enables them to gain the necessary experience. The problem of mobilizing and rallying politically active forces or a political army of the revolution acquires a relatively independent significance within the framework of the more general task of gaining over the majority. It may even be considered as the basic link in the solution of this problem, for the positions and behavior of the politically active forces set the tone of the entire revolutionary process. The political army of the socialist revolution is the shock force which, under the leadership of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, directly accomplishes the seizure of power, using it as a means for gaining over on its side that part of the majority which is unable to surmount its hesitations and indecisiveness until it is factually convinced that the state leadership of society by

the proletariat is consistent with its interests. "Such toiling and exploited strata," Lenin pointed out, "provide the proletarian vanguard with allies with whose help it gains the solid population majority. However, the proletariat could gain such allies only with the help of an instrument such as state power, i.e., only after it has overthrown the bourgeoisie and destroyed its governmental apparatus" (Poln. Sobr. Soch., Vol 40, p 23). Here Lenin formulated a general law of the socialist revolution which extends, in a modified fashion, to the peaceful way for the seizure of power by the working class. It is impossible to imagine progress along this way if there is no politically active majority within the popular majority, going ahead, conquering progressive political positions one after the other and, on their basis, proving practically to its hesitating potential allies that the working class alone can liberate them from capitalist oppression. The difference between the peaceful and violent ways does not lie in the least in the extent to which the masses have become aware of socialist objectives. The difference lies in the fact that the peaceful road to state power of a socialist type is preceded by transitional types of revolutionary-democratic power in which the working class already holds dominating positions. That is why at those stages the working class has already gained the possibility to use the power levers to win on the side of socialism ever-broader toiling masses. In other words, on the way to power and prior to its complete seizure by the working class, the bridge-heads enabling the masses to gain that very political experience required if they are to become aware of and accept socialist objectives are broadened. It could be assumed that this circumstance may become the reason for some substantial characteristics in the process of shaping the mass forces of the socialist revolution, such as the increased complexity of the very system of class and political alliances, multiplicity of stages in developing the political awareness and mentality of the masses, and the higher level of stability of existing political forms and ideological stereotypes. All this, however, only increases the role of the politically active segment of the popular majority as its revolutionary nucleus.

To what extent are the politically active forces of the revolution widespread? It would be hardly possible to provide quantitative criteria applicable to all circumstances. Such criteria are based on the need to establish a decisive superiority of force over the reaction in the process of the seizure of power. Lenin considered this a political law of the revolution. "To enjoy overwhelming superiority of forces at the decisive moment and the decisive point," he wrote, "is a 'law' in achieving military success. It is also a law for achieving political success, particularly in that fierce and active struggle among classes known as revolution" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 40, p 6). Formulating the parameters of the political army of the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out three indicators: 1. the overwhelming majority of the proletariat; 2. almost half of the armed forces; 3. overwhelming superiority of forces at the decisive moment and at the decisive points--the capitals and the fronts close to the center (Ibid., page 10). Naturally, such indicators could vary in different specific historical situations, particularly in the case of a peaceful seizure of

power, when the 'decisive moment' is preceded by transitional lines gained in the offensive of the working class against the power of monopoly capitalism. Whatever the circumstances, however, the Leninist analysis remains a classical model for the methodology used in such an assessment. In revolutionary times interrelationships among classes, social groups, and political parties are exceptionally flexible. In circumstances governed by a tense national crisis a variant is possible in which the initiative of a small minority could trigger an avalanche of a mass movement which develops into a revolution. "This is one of the exceptional cases," Engels wrote, "when a handful of people could make a revolution. In other words, a small push could make the entire system maintaining a very unstable balance to crumble...and, through an act insignificant in itself, release the type of explosive forces which can no longer be tamed...From potential the people's energy turns into kinetic..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," Vol 36, pp 260-263). In a certain sense this variant occurred in the Cuban revolution in which the bold initiative of the revolutionaries, headed by F. Castro, gave an impetus to a chain reaction of mass actions which developed into a movement by a majority of the people against the Batista regime. Lenin also conceived that "a revolution may be initiated even by a very small party and brought to its victorious end" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, p 32). However, this is possible only if the party can accurately assess the objective circumstances, relies on the masses, and, in the final account, involves the majority of the working people in the revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist party has always oriented itself toward the mass political forces. However, the concept of the "masses," as Lenin emphasized, changes depending on the circumstances under which they operate. At the beginning of the struggle even several thousand revolutionary workers could constitute a mass. When the revolution is ripe this word has a different meaning: "The concept of mass changes in the sense that it means a majority, not a simple majority of workers but the majority of all of the exploited; any other type of understanding is inadmissible for the revolutionaries; any other meaning of this term becomes alien" (Ibid., pp 31-32).

Yet, the dialectics of this process is such that broadening the volume of the mass to the level of an absolute majority complicates the nature and structure of relations among its component class and political forces. The unity between the working class and its nonproletarian allies in the struggle for common interests does not eliminate in the least the differences existing in their economic and political interests and their ideological differences. Therefore, unity within the revolutionary majority is a living, a dynamic unity which presumes a comparison and even conflict between different positions and views, and a search for compromises which do not encroach upon the autonomy of the allies but which consolidate the majority around the working class. The difficulty in surmounting the centrifugal trends within the alliance between revolutionary and democratic forces was revealed to its fullest extent in the Chilean revolution. The struggle between ideological and political trends in the Popular Unity, very sharp at times, weakened the positions of the Allende government facing a counterrevolutionary offensive.

The unification of a popular majority on the basis of a revolutionary platform depends to a tremendous extent on the positions and activities of the Marxist Leninist party. The ability to rally the broad democratic forces around the working class is one of the main criteria of the party's readiness to fulfill its vanguard role in the revolutionary process. In their final document, at the Berlin conference, the European communists proclaimed that they will "act in such a way that their policy and ideals of justice and progress, whose bearers they are, become, to an ever-greater extent, a force contributing to the development of the broadest possible unity of the toiling and popular masses." At the same time, within the framework of such a broad unity, the communist parties represent the most consistent revolutionary line expressing the basic interests of the working class and all working people. As L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in his Berlin conference speech, joining other democratic currents, "the communists remain revolutionaries, convinced supporters of the replacement of the capitalist system with a socialist system. They subordinate all their activities to the solution of this historical problem."

One of the decisive factors in unifying the majority of the working people around the revolutionary vanguard is the formulation by the latter of a clear socioeconomic program which takes into consideration the interests of all classes and social groups participating in the struggle. Such a program gives the allies of the working class the confidence that the revolution would not harm them but would satisfy their demands. The absence of such a program gives grounds for doubts and suspicion among the town and country strata of the petite bourgeoisie, obstructs the implementation of an economic policy aimed at satisfying the vital demands of the masses, and hinders the surmounting of reactionary sabotage and the implementation of radical social changes.

The popular majority on which the revolutionary vanguard of the working class relies also changes in the course of the revolution itself. The change of revolutionary stages raises each time the task of securing a majority and creating the necessary superiority of forces over the counter-revolution under the new conditions, taking into consideration the demands of the circumstances and the higher level of political experience gained by the masses. The solution of this problem is particularly topical, for the reaction as well tries to mobilize forces and develops ever more refined means for countering the working class. This confirms Marx's statement that the revolution goes forth creating a united counterrevolution. Only the constant unification of the motive forces of the revolution, the political isolation of its factual and potential opponents, and the neutralizing of the hesitating and unstable elements alone can resolve this contradiction within the revolutionary process without surrendering the positions already conquered and moving toward the objective. One of the conditions for the continuity of the revolutionary process is the timely consideration of occurring changes and of the shifting of the center of gravity precisely to the unification of forces which could lead it ever farther in the struggle for the solution of the problems facing a given revolutionary stage.

There is no need for the communists to conceal that their objective is socialism, for the achievement of this objective is consistent with the interests and aspirations of the tremendous majority of the people. The meaning of the transitional stages is for the allies of the working class to become convinced through personal experience of the need to move in that direction. The communists are marching toward socialism together with the people. No other way is possible, for socialism is the result of the people's creativity.

5003

CSO: 1802

COMPETITION AND ECONOMY OF MATERIAL RESOURCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 45-56

[Article by Ye. Chernov]

[Text] Formulating the ways of development of the socialist economy, our party always takes into consideration the possibilities presented by skillful and thrifty economic management and the creative initiative of the masses. The 25th CPSU Congress called upon the Soviet people to make effective use of each ruble, working hour, and ton of output, to promote systematically a system of economy, and to eliminate negligence totally. Today the thrifty attitude toward material resources is ascribed particular importance.

The 1976-1980 five-year plan for the development of the USSR national economy calls for reducing the material intensiveness of public output by 1.5 percent in order to save some 8 billion rubles by the last year of the five-year plan.

In an effort to please the homeland with new labor accomplishments and score not only greater but better and more economical achievements, the working people of town and country undertook the implementation of this task enthusiastically. Their profound patriotic feeling became a powerful motive force of the nationwide socialist competition in honor of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Thousands and thousands of production workers and entire collectives decided to fulfill by that time the assignments of the first 2 years of the five-year plan. Diaries of shock anniversary work are being kept at industrial enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. Anniversary saving accounts are being opened. The socialist pledges of cities, oblasts, krays, and republics pay particular attention to the saving of material resources. Displaying high political and labor activeness, for example, the people of Leningrad decided to save in 1977 30,000 tons of ferrous and 2,000 tons of nonferrous metals, 200 million kilowatt-hours of electric power, 90,000 tons of conventional fuel, and 190,000 square meters of textiles above the plan. The working people of the Ukrainian SSR pledged to reduce the material intensiveness of output in the 10th Five-Year Plan and thus to increase the national

income by 2 billion rubles in the course of 5 years, save no less than 3.5 billion rubles by lowering production costs of industrial output, master the production of 133 new economical metal shapes, and increase the production of its most progressive types by 50-100 percent, which would enable them to save over 1.7 million tons of ferrous metals.

Therefore, the struggle for the rational utilization of material resources is becoming everywhere one of the most important components of the competition for upgrading production effectiveness and improving work quality.

The thrifty and economical utilization of raw materials, materials, electric power, and fuel would be inconceivable without the profoundly interested approach of the workers toward the affairs of their collective and their thrifty attitude toward the material values placed by the society at the collective's disposal. V. I. Lenin saw the shoots of a new attitude toward labor and products supplied "not to the workers personally or their 'near and dear' but to 'others,' i.e., to the entire society, to tens and hundreds of millions of people as the awareness of the working people of the need to upgrade labor productivity and save the wealth they have created..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 39, p 22). The entire socialist way of life promotes a thrifty attitude toward raw materials, materials, fuel, and electric power. The development of such an attitude is a subject of constant concern on the part of party and other social organizations.

In the course of the nationwide discussion of the draft of the new USSR Constitution the working people have expressed their complete support of article 61 which makes it incumbent upon the USSR citizens to safeguard and strengthen socialist property and to fight thefts and waste of state and public property. The Soviet people are clearly aware of the tremendous national economic significance of thrift. They realize that we are economizing for the sake of what is most precious to us--the wealth and power of the homeland and the prosperity and blossoming of our people. This awareness is a powerful incentive in the creative search for reserves.

Responding to the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, the working people of town and country have comprehensively launched an all-union socialist competition under the slogan "Let Us Work Better, and Increase Effectiveness and Quality!" The discovery and utilization of production reserves existing everywhere--at each enterprise and workplace--is possible only if everyone becomes involved in their discovery, and if the struggle for thrift is waged systematically. In the Ninth Five-Year Plan many valuable initiatives launched in previous years were developed further in production associations, plants, factories, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. Meanwhile, many new forms of competition for thrift were created, contributing to the development of the creative initiative of the working people. Even greater attention is being paid to improving the organization of the thrift competition in production collectives this five-year plan--a five-year plan of effectiveness and quality.

Regular reviews of production economy and reserves are an important method for mobilizing the creative activeness of the broad toiling masses. Such reviews, whose very nature encompasses a spirit of competitiveness, have long been used as a reliable means for involving the workers in the movement for the economical utilization of materials. They became particularly widespread during the Ninth Five-Year Plan. In the course of the all-union public review of the use of production reserves and savings, based on the appeal of the AUCCTU and the Komsomol Central Committee, in 5 years the working people submitted over 25 million suggestions, over 70 percent of which were acted upon. According to data submitted by ministries, departments, and central committees of trade unions, this made possible the saving of over 4 million tons of rolled ferrous and nonferrous metals, over 40 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power, 40 million gigacalories of thermal power, 20 million tons of conventional fuel, approximately 4 million tons of cement, about 10 million cubic meters of timber, and almost 1 billion rubles' worth of other materials.

During the Ninth Five-Year Plan, every year the Gor'kiy Order of Lenin milling machines plant was proclaimed the winner of the all-union public review. The plant's collective was able to achieve such high results because the party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations pay great attention to the struggle for economy, comparability of results achieved by the participants in the review, and the dissemination of best experience. The plant has drafted a regulation on the intraplant review clearly stipulating the directions to be followed in the search for reserves, the forms of material and moral incentive to the winners, and other competition conditions. Plant and shop review commissions have been put in charge of the public review. The results of the review and the course of the utilization of the suggestions submitted by the working people are discussed at shop party, trade union, and Komsomol meetings. The struggle for the full utilization of reserves is extensively covered in the plant's newspaper. The plant's trade union committee has repeatedly heard reports submitted by heads of shops and sectors at its sessions on the implementation of measures related to applying the suggestions of the working people. Here the results of the competition are determined twice annually. The winners are presented with honor certificates and cash bonuses. In the course of the review the Gor'kiy machine tool builders submitted over 10,000 suggestions during the five-year plan. The implementation of about 7,000 of them resulted in annual savings of 2.5 million rubles. The participants in the review helped the plant to save nearly 2,000 tons of metal and approximately 8 million kilowatt-hours of electric power.

This five-year plan as well there is an all-union public review of savings. The extensive participation of the working people in the search for production reserves has made it possible, in the very first year, to save raw materials, materials, fuel, and other labor objects worth approximately 3 billion rubles. Noting such achievements in the field of the rational utilization of material resources, we must also bear in mind that possibilities for their savings are still far from completely utilized. This

calls for further improvements in the organization of economy reviews and work methods aimed at mobilizing the creative activeness of workers in enterprises and associations.

Practical experience gained in the holding of public reviews on reserves has confirmed that not all production sectors yield equal results. Indeed, any enterprise has shops and technological processes which provide better possibilities for saving compared with others. This applies, above all, to procurement and auxiliary production facilities. For example, at machine-building plants the lion's share in metal savings comes from casting and forging shops. Upgrading the quality of castings and forgings, and reducing the allowance of blanks tangibly add to the amount of metals saved. Naturally, such sectors draw the biggest attention in the organization of the socialist competition for economy at enterprises. It is above all they that determine the fulfillment of obligations included in the counterplans of plants and factories. However, the fact that shops for semifinished products offer relatively greater possibilities for economy should not lead us to ignore the possibilities for saving materials and semifinished goods at processing and assembly shops.

The development of competition for a thrifty attitude toward material resources is hindered not by the lack of possibilities at one or another production sector but by the insufficient attention paid by some managers to the creation of proper organizational prerequisites for the truly mass participation of the working people in the struggle for economy.

This means, above all, the effective accounting of the use of raw and other materials. Clearly, an effective struggle for economy could be developed wherever outlays of material resources are controlled accurately and operatively not only on the scale of the enterprise, but of the shop, sector, brigade, and individual workplace. Unfortunately, such accounting is far from always organized at all plants and factories. There are even sectors without control-measuring equipment, meters, and weighing facilities.

One of the most effective methods in the struggle for thrift--the individual savings accounts, extensively used currently--was developed initially as an effective method for the accounting of resources, as a means for improving primary cost accounting. Such accounts were introduced as early as 1957 on the initiative of the working people of Sverdlovskaya Oblast. They were used to keep daily track of used material values. They indicated the quantity of saved materials and their value, and the way through which the economy was achieved. However, it soon became apparent that individual savings accounts were not simply accounting documents but an important means for mobilizing the creative activeness of the collective. They offer the possibility clearly to indicate the contribution of one or another worker to the collective search for reserves and make it possible to detect concealed possibilities and direct the attention to them.

Currently many enterprises using individual accounts have formulated special regulations for handling them. All account data are entered only on the basis of documents signed by the foreman and the storekeeper. Usually the regulations provide a specific list of such documents. For example, records on rolled metal and other cut materials are based on requests for materials; entries on power and fuel savings are based on the readings of control-measuring apparatus as entered in the log book, and so on. In order to insure the operative accounting of materials and semifinished goods used and electric power consumed, extensive use is made of computers. Thus, the use of instruments has been determined for each specific operation. Data on instruments issued to the worker are entered on a punched card which is delivered to the information-computer center. At the end of the month a printout is received showing the use of instruments by individual workers and overexpenditures or savings in physical or cash figures. Individual accounts have considerably improved records on outlays of material values at the Verkh-Isetskiy metallurgical plant, the Vil'nyus Construction-Finishing Machines Association, and many other enterprises.

The well-organized norming of material outlays is an absolute prerequisite for the opening of individual accounts. Savings are possible only if the amount of raw and other materials needed for the production of an individual item is known. However, enterprises frequently use such norms only in basic production. As a rule, in auxiliary work they are not set at all. At best, experimental-statistical norms are used here. Frequently materials are issued "by eye," on the basis of the previous year's data and in bulk, for the entire 10 days or the month. Yet, the very fact that technically substantiated norms for material outlays have been applied disciplines the worker and makes him think of how to economize. It is important for the norms to be regularly revised and made consistent with the level of consumption of material resources achieved at leading enterprises.

Organizing competition based on individual saving accounts the party and trade union committees pay particular attention to informing the entire collective of the achievements of thrifty workers. For example, at the Ural'sk Railroad Car Plant imeni F. E. Dzerzhinskiy individual brigade and shift accounts are made public at shops and economy offices. Such an organization of the work contributes to the development of competitiveness and facilitates the control over the implementation of obligations. The method of individual accounts itself contributes to insuring the comparability of competition results and the clear formulation of criteria for assessing the achievements of the winners.

Thanks to the extensive development of the competition for economy based on individual accounts, in the Ninth Five-Year Plan the collective of the Uralvagonzavod was able to save materials worth almost 4.6 million rubles. The plant could operate 3 weeks with the fuel saved and 1 and 1/2 months with the saved electric power. The leading brigades achieved quite substantial individual accounts. Thus, thanks to the efficient cutting of the rolled metal, stricter tolerances in the production of semifinished

goods, and the use of waste materials, the forging brigade headed by M. Yuminov was able to save 30 tons of metal; the painters' brigade headed by A. Kuznetsov was able to save over 72 tons of materials. The gear-cutting brigade headed by Hero of Socialist Labor A. Khramtsov was the first to open a savings account at the Uralmash Association. The initiative was supported by the entire collective. One way or another 90 percent of the piece-rate workers here contributed to the general saving fund. As a result of the implementation of 20,000 measures elaborated on the basis of creative plans and pledges, in the Ninth Five-Year Plan the association was able to save over 30,000 tons of ferrous and over 150 tons of nonferrous metals.

Addressing the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev called for "learning how to struggle more effectively for higher effectiveness." The competition for economy should not be reduced to simply recording in one or another document such as, for example, the individual account, amounts of materials saved by individual workers, brigades, or shops. The competition becomes substantially more effective if the search for reserves is planned and if the elaboration of obligations takes into consideration the sum total of problems related to labor and material savings. The interdependence of the factors related to upgrading effectiveness has increased drastically under present-day conditions. Working to achieve the planned growth of output, we must thoroughly analyze the additional material and financial outlays this would require. Each suggestion aimed at saving materials should be critically considered from the viewpoint of whether it may harm the quality or worsen the consumer qualities of the goods. It is important for current savings not to result in a reduced effectiveness of the utilization of equipment or worsen the quality of the goods. From the national economic viewpoint production effectiveness can increase only if the overall outlays--current and long-term--are reduced per unit of output. It is clear that under such conditions the struggle for economy cannot be separated from the other forms of socialist competition but acts as its component, as an indivisible structural part of the integrated comprehensive movement for upgrading effectiveness.

The intensified comprehensive nature of the socialist competition and the need to enter in the obligations the complex interconnection among factors related to upgrading production effectiveness are reflected in the organization of the competition itself. This is manifested, first of all, in the increased importance of the economic study of the possible consequences of one or another measure earmarked in the pledges and, secondly, in the increased complexity of the structure of the obligations themselves. Presently they include a longer list of interrelated indicators. At many enterprises individual economy accounts have gained a new content. They have become comprehensive accounts for upgrading production effectiveness. They show not only savings from reduced outlays of materials, instruments, electric power, and fuel, but the lowering of labor intensiveness in norm/hours. The economic effect of the improved quality is taken into consideration as well.

In such comprehensive individual accounts upgrading work effectiveness and quality should not be given second priority in the saving and rational utilization of material resources. Specific indicators of lowering the outlay of materials, reducing the percentage of faulty items, and lowering production costs must become an inseparable structural part of the socialist obligations of shops, sectors, and brigades, and of the workers' individual plans. Their implementation must be controlled most strictly.

Practical experience has indicated that the unification and coordination of the efforts of brigades, sectors, and shops are acquiring ever-greater importance in the competition for the thrifty utilization of material resources. In a number of cases it is difficult even to determine the individual contribution to the saving of materials, for it is occasionally manifested only as the end result of the activities of the collective or even of several collectives. For this reason, for example, brigade saving accounts offer greater possibilities for a precise economic computation and for the substantiation of the most effective measures compared with individual accounts.

Reality adamantly calls for the further development of cooperation among workers involved in a single technological flow. This takes place, above all, through the search for new organizational methods for collective responsibility. Seemingly disparate methods in terms of origin and content, reflecting specific production aspects in various sectors, such as work on a single order by two or more previously separate brigades in the clothing industry, the brigade contracting method in construction and machine-building, comprehensive mechanized units in agriculture, and others, share the fact that all of them are directed toward developing efficient organization in the work, increasing reciprocal responsibility, and improving end results. Furthermore, the creation of such brigades and teams and the extensive use of cost accounting principles in their work are incentives for the energetic search for reserves and for increasing the struggle for economy.

The first year of the 10th Five-Year Plan was marked by the birth of the movement under the slogan: "A Workers' Guarantee for a Quality Five-Year Plan!" The workers of three leading brigades at the Moscow Electrical Machines Plant imeni Vladimir Il'ich, operating within a single technological chain, assumed the obligation to develop jointly maximally favorable conditions for upgrading the effectiveness and quality of the work of related workers, particularly in terms of saving on materials. Their initiative which is a manifestation of the increased responsibility of the workers to their fellow workers and to society was supported at thousands of enterprises in different economic sectors.

The movement for unifying the efforts of technologically interrelated collectives of sectors and shops will unquestionably be a durable one. Such competition not only yields considerable economic results but carries a major social and educational load: its participants develop a greater

feeling of responsibility for the outcome of their brigade and the entire collective. Exactingness and principle-mindedness rise. Comradely cooperation is strengthened. Intraplant competition among related collectives, reflecting the specific nature of the contemporary stage of division and cooperation of labor, is developing in many national economic sectors in the country.

We should point out that so far the main feature of the competition among related brigades is maintaining the required production rhythm and guaranteeing the high quality of semifinished goods. However, in the process of the development of such related competition within the enterprise its participants pay ever-greater attention to reducing the outlay of materials and the percentage of defective goods, to lowering production costs, comprehensively upgrading outlays, and increasing effectiveness.

Occasionally major complexities arise in determining the results of the competition of related brigades. The principal of them is to insure result comparability. Currently attempts are being made at the enterprises to use a system of points in rating the quality of the work, as well as coefficients for the recomputation of heterogeneous brigade work indicators. This experience should be attentively studied and subjected to extensive practical tests. Furthermore, in our view, it is already possible to simplify the determination of the achievements of brigades whose joint efforts determine the saving of raw materials, materials, and semifinished goods, by opening in their name joint savings accounts.

The efficiently organized material and moral incentive of the workers is an important prerequisite for the development of the competition for economy. Let us note that currently it is aimed above all at upgrading labor productivity and takes fully into consideration material savings. According to the current standard regulation the amount of the bonus may not exceed 50 percent of the value of saved raw and other materials. However, it is virtually impossible for anyone to reach this maximum, since the bonus fund has an overall ceiling (based on a percentage of the piece-rate earnings of the workers). Properly working brigades are usually awarded bonuses for overfulfilling output norms, improving equipment utilization, and so on. This exhausts the bonus fund entirely. That is why an obvious disparity arises between the amount of savings and of bonuses at enterprises, particularly those actively concerned with the rational utilization of materials.

Obviously, the system of material incentive for those competing for economy must be improved further. For example, in basic production in which the norming and accounting of material outlays are better organized compared with auxiliary work, as a whole it is more difficult to find further possibilities. Yet, substantial possibilities exist in the case of semifinished goods which have undergone several processing stages and in which a great deal of labor has been invested. Losses caused by their inefficient use are considerably higher. We believe, therefore, that in this case we should encourage above all the strict observance of technically substantiated

norms governing material outlays. Movements for reducing such outlays should be encouraged at sectors using mainly experimental-statistical material outlay norms. In our view, this could be achieved by using an incentive form similar to the Aksay workers' bonus system based on awarding the workers a certain percentage of wage savings resulting from the revision of output norms. In a similar way some of the funds saved as a result of the review of norms governing material outlays could be paid out to the production workers who have initiated such revisions over a certain period of time. Obviously, material incentive should be provided also to collectives of related brigades for reducing the weight of forgings and the tolerances of semifinished pieces.

As a result of all this obligations to save on raw and other materials would assume a proper place in the individual plans of workers, engineers, and technicians, along with indicators of increased output and reduced labor outlays. Such comprehensive individual plans for this year and for the entire five-year plan will be a solid base for the adoption of comprehensive obligations by brigades, shops, and other production subdivisions.

Counterplans are the generalized result of the creative searches of labor collectives. As stipulated in the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee decree on the all-union socialist competition in the Tenth Five-Year Plan, they are an important method for the active participation of labor collectives and individual workers in the finding and fullest possible utilization of internal production reserves, expressing their desire to make specific contributions to the reaching of objectives with lower resource outlays. The counterplans thus combine within a single flow centralized planning with the initiative of the broad toiling masses.

The further improvement of counterplans takes place, above all, through the evermore extensive elaboration of a set of measures aimed at upgrading the effectiveness with which labor and material resources are used. Summaries of workers' suggestions on saving raw materials, materials, fuel and electric power are another of their important components.

Naturally, the indicators of material savings included in the counterplan could not be separated from its other indicators. They are linked with them through a system of technical economic computations. The counterplan always contains suggestions on the production of additional goods. Such obligations must be thoroughly substantiated from the viewpoint of material and technical supplies and marketing possibilities. Unfortunately, this is not always done. Yet, many types of raw materials and materials used in our country are based on funds. In other words, the enterprise is allocated a strictly limited quantity of metal, fuel, and so on, based on the annual or quarterly program. Under such conditions above-plan output should be produced above all with the resources at the disposal of the specific collective. Calling for the increased production of one or another commodity over and above the planned assignment, enterprise and association workers

must be absolutely confident, first of all, of the need for such goods by the national economy and, secondly, of the fact that respective material resources will be found for such an increase. Therefore, the initiative of collectives assuming the obligation to increase output by saving materials, fuel, and energy is very important. Last five-year plan the obligations assumed by many collectives already included such an item.

In 1973 a brigade of assembly workers of the radio tubes shop of the MELZ production-technical association, headed by G. Aref'yeva, pledged to work 1 hour per week with saved raw materials, materials, and power. This initiative was extensively supported by many enterprises throughout the country. On the eve of the 25th CPSU Congress the collective of the radio tubes shop reported that in the past 3 years it had worked a total of 41 days using saved raw and other materials. This enabled the assembly workers to produce additional goods worth hundreds of thousands of rubles. As a whole, the MELZ collective fulfilled its 5-year assignment for all technical and economic indicators at the beginning of May 1975. Additional output worth millions of rubles was produced as a result of economy and improved labor organization.

In the new five-year plan this movement is developing extensively. The counterplans of tens and hundreds of enterprises call for increasing output with virtually no additional amounts of raw and other materials. Currently every collective makes a thorough estimate of its forces, ways and possibilities, and determines what it could achieve by the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution. In particular, the workers at the Volgograd Tractor Plant are planning to produce by the date of the anniversary 400 tractors above the plan, including 100 made of saved materials. The Leningrad workers have decided to manufacture this year out of saved raw materials 150 machines, instruments, and apparatus, 1 million pairs of shoes, and over 130,000 pieces of clothing and knitted goods. Many collectives pledged to make rational use of production wastes and organize the production of consumer goods made of such materials. In this sense the saving of materials represents a great possibility. Suffice it to say that in the last five-year plan various commodities worth over 500 million rubles were produced this way.

The counterplans which sum up the suggestions of workers in enterprises and associations are valuable because they call for increased output as a result of the fuller utilization of internal reserves, i.e., as a result of increased production effectiveness. Yet, the counterplan becomes truly effective when it takes fully into consideration the interests of the consumer. Labor objects and tools are merely the intermediary products needed for the manufacturing of finished goods which are precisely the most important in terms of the national economy. "It is important," pointed out the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th congress, "not only to remember that the final objective of the production process is to satisfy one or another social requirement but to draw practical conclusions from this." From this viewpoint insuring the precise consistency

between the technical parameters of raw materials and semifinished goods and the requirements of those who will use them assumes an ever-greater importance.

The situation of metals in the country was profoundly studied at the 25th CPSU Congress and the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Steel smelting in the country is increasing with every passing year. Nevertheless, an acute shortage of rolled steel goods is always present. One of the main reasons for this is the fact that the metallurgical industry does not produce always in sufficient quantities the type of brands and varieties of rolled metals needed above all by the consumers. As a result other shapes must be used which results in the overexpenditure of metal.

Increasing the production of economical rolled metal shapes calls for further planning improvements and the implementation of various organizational-economic measures. The initiative of enterprises in the metallurgical industry and the primary party organizations, and party raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms must play an important role in the solution of this problem.

Chelyabinskaya Oblast has properly developed its organizational and political work aimed at upgrading the quality of metal goods and the effectiveness of their use. Here problems of ferrous metals economy are the focal point of attention of the primary party organizations and are actively discussed at meetings and practical science conferences and by workers' collectives. The party obkom (and party gorkoms and raykoms) have permanent public councils on metal saving which include heads of production facilities, specialists, and best workers. The public councils coordinate the efforts of the engineering and technical and economic services. They sum up progressive experience, control the implementation of practical science recommendations and the utilization of rationalization suggestions, and sponsor competition reviews. In the course of the last review alone over 90,000 suggestions were submitted. All metallurgical and machine-building enterprises have formulated long-term plans for improving the utilization of metals. According to available estimates, their implementation would save the national economy no less than 1 million tons of such output by the end of the five-year plan.

The oblast enterprises have set up 1,100 creative brigades for the solution of specific problems. They include 5,000 specialists, 3,300 workers-innovators, and over 800 scientists. Cooperation among intraplant and intrasectorial creative brigades rallying the workers of the Magnitogorsk metallurgical combine and the Volga Automotive Vehicles Plant, the Chelyabinsk and Verkh-Isetskiy metallurgical plants, Uralmash, and others has proved to be particularly fruitful. Savings based on such cooperation have already reached many millions of rubles.

The metallurgical workers are showing a profound understanding of their responsibility to society by including in their counterplans pledges to increase the production of precisely the types of rolled metal needed most

of all by the consumers contributing to the saving of metal in subsequent processing stages. It is no secret that the existing system for planning the production of rolled metal in tons encourages the workers in this sector to increase first of all the weight of the goods produced rather than to reduce metal intensiveness by the users of the rolled metal. Formulating their counterplans the collectives of leading metallurgical enterprises assume additional obligations related to mastering the production of new items and improving their quality, thus making a most substantial contribution to nationwide savings.

Experience proves that the greatest possibilities for material savings are found at crossing points of related production facilities. This is confirmed, for example, by the counterplan of the Magnitogorsk metallurgical combine imeni V. I. Lenin. Its collectives pledged for 1977 to save at least 70,000 tons of metal for the national economy by upgrading quality, increasing the variety of metal goods and producing more rolled goods with minimal tolerances. We must stress that the counterplans of enterprises in all industrial sectors--not only metallurgy--should be directed to a greater extent than in the past toward the fuller satisfaction of the needs of enterprises which are supplied with raw materials, materials, and semi-finished goods, maximally contributing to their economical utilization of material resources.

The development of cost accounting relations among enterprises strengthens the regimen of savings in the national economy and the reduction of losses caused by the substitution of materials. This method is becoming increasingly widespread in industry and other economic sectors. So far, however, the mechanism motivating the enterprises to observe contractually stipulated delivery conditions and produce goods within the specified variety has not been organized. The competition for increasing the percentage of goods supplied on the basis of consumers' orders and economic contracts reflects the desire of the collectives to make their contribution to the solution of this problem. The timely implementation of the production plan for the entire variety of goods is becoming now the most important criterion in establishing competition results. Thus, among the Minsk machine builders only the enterprise insuring output deliveries entirely consistent with orders and contracts may be proclaimed competition winner.

The development of direct cost accounting relations among enterprises contributes to the establishment of closer contacts among collectives engaged in the joint production of one or another finished item. A variety of methods for the establishment of such contacts has been established, reflecting the active search for new organizational forms of relations among the collectives of related enterprises. For example, visits by members of related enterprises in the period of the elaboration of counterplans are being practiced evermore frequently. The purpose of such contacts is to coordinate the pledges of technologically interrelated collectives and to coordinate their efforts aimed at increasing end production results. The next step in strengthening relations among collectives

is the conclusion of contracts on reciprocal aid in the implementation of obligations and on the socialist competition among related enterprises. Such bilateral and multilateral contracts offer the possibility to provide social control over the entire chain of production relations. They strengthen the cost accounting relations of contacts established among party and other public organizations.

Such method of interaction has been used over a number of years by the collectives of the KMaruda combine, the Makeyevka metallurgical plant, and the Rostsel'mash plant. In the 10th Five-Year Plan these enterprises, joined by the Lebedin ore concentration combine, concluded a contract for socialist competition and called for launching the competition under the slogan "Ore-Metal-Machines." The objective of the initiators is to extend the movement for workers' guarantees in the five-year plan to relations among related enterprises, and insure an organized and efficient rhythm and reciprocal aid among enterprises regardless of their location or departmental affiliation.

The main aspect of the competition among related enterprises at present is to insure the efficiency of procurements of raw materials, materials, and complementing goods, thus achieving a normal rhythm of output and guaranteeing the high quality of semifinished goods at all stages in the course of the process leading to the production of finished goods. So far measures aimed at lowering the material intensiveness of goods and increasing the output of materials whose use will contribute to savings by consuming enterprises have not found their proper place in the pledges of related workers.

From this viewpoint the initiative of the collective of the Leningrad Krasnyy Vyborzhets plant is particularly valuable. It resolved not only to reach high effectiveness at its enterprise but to contribute comprehensively to the successful work of related workers and to upgrade steadily the effectiveness of intersectorial cooperation. The metallurgical workers pledged to supply the type of shaped rolled nonferrous metals which would enable their partners to save no less than 40 million rubles. They pledged to develop and master the production of 200 new economical rolled metal shapes over and above their five-year plan. On the basis of their obligations they have already mastered the production of an economical copper angle rolled metal for the Khar'kov electric locomotives, and originally designed pipes with a spiral surface for thermoelectric power plants. The first initiatives of the Leningrad workers were supported by their old competition friends--the metallurgical workers of the Kol'chugino plant imeni S. Ordzhonikidze. As a whole, the sectorial enterprises will save the national economy over 250 million rubles through intersectorial cooperation.

Socialist competition is a tremendous constructive force which speeds up the progress of our society on the path to communism. The duty of the party and other social organizations and of economic managers is to be always concerned with the development of the competition and to set favorable economic and organizational conditions for the manifestation of the creative

activeness of the working people. In his speech at the 16th congress of USSR trade unions Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that good initiatives need not only praise but constant actual support. From this viewpoint efforts to improve our economic mechanism, organize further the planning and incentive system, and make assessment indicators of enterprise production activities consistent with present requirements play an important role.

As we know, today one of the main indicators of work results of collectives is the volume of goods marketed. The higher the volume the greater the wage fund and the higher the withholdings for incentive funds become. Yet, the volume of goods marketed largely depends on the cost of the processed raw material. For this reason the production workers are unwilling to produce economical types of rolled metal shapes and are not in a hurry to replace heavy with lighter-weight machinery.

The imperfection of the indicators used in assessing the results of economic activities of enterprises does not contribute in the least to the development of the competition for economy. It hinders the process of establishing the most effective system of interrelationships among related workers. The planning, price setting, and economic incentive system must become more oriented toward the achievement of the best possible end national economic results and, therefore, the maximal utilization of material resources. From this viewpoint increasing the role of indicators of the implementation of economic contracts in planning and the strict observance of stipulations governing the variety and quality of goods are of great importance.

In some cases, in our view it would be expedient to allow the enterprises to withhold for economic incentive funds a certain percentage of the value of saved materials so that such funds could be used especially to reward the thrifty. Such funds could be paid out in addition to all other bonuses and regardless of the size of the latter.

The effectiveness of the competition for economy also largely depends on the organization of the planning of the use of material resources, fuel, and energy. In many sectors the planned estimates of material requirements are still based on enterprise orders rather than on scientific norms. As a result, for example, some associations, plants, and factories set very loose ceilings for electric power consumption. In this case "above-plan" savings, as investigations by people's controllers have shown, frequently conceal negligence and substantial losses.

In the 10th Five-Year Plan, in accordance with the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, extensive measures will be implemented to apply progressive norms for material outlays. Planning the production of output on the basis of such norms demands greater attention to such factors of reducing material intensiveness as scientific and technical progress, improved production technology, use of more economical materials, and reduced weight of structures. Reducing material intensiveness is currently an important criterion in assessing the technical level of a commodity. That is why it

is becoming an indicator of the quality of the work of design and planning organizations. It is not astounding that the role of this criterion increases in determining the results of competition among workers.

Reality demands a change in the nature of the competition under present conditions and its ever-greater orientation toward upgrading effectiveness and improving quality work indicators. Such a change, however, would not be a one-time action. It would presume the purposeful work of party and trade union committees aimed at improving the organization of the movement for thrift and upgrading the quality of planning and management activities. The most important component of this work is the development in all working people of an economical attitude toward public resources.

5003

CSO: 1802

GUARDING SOCIALIST LEGALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 57-68

[Article by R. Rudenko, USSR general prosecutor]

[Text] The 25th Leninist party congress led our people to a new historical level in the building of communism. The basic and topical problems of CPSU economic, sociopolitical, and ideological-educational work at the present stage, elaborated by the congress, establish the main line followed in the further strengthening and development of true democracy in our country.

As was emphasized at the congress the all-round development of the political system of the Soviet society, expressed in the improvement of socialist statehood, the further development of Soviet democracy, and the strengthening of the legal foundations of governmental and social life is an important direction in the entire work for the building of communism. The decisions of the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum serve the implementation of the tasks set by the congress. After hearing and discussing the report submitted by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Constitutional Commission "On the Draft of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," the plenum approved in its essential lines the submitted draft and submitted the matter to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. On the recommendation of the plenum the draft of the constitution was submitted to nationwide discussion. The Soviet people approved the draft warmly and unanimously. Its discussion is taking place throughout the country under circumstances of high political and labor activeness and great upsurge in all realms of social life.

The draft of the new constitution sums up the entire constitutional period of Soviet history and enriches it with a new content consistent with contemporary requirements. It is based on the renovation and improvement of Soviet legislation carried out in recent years and reflects the profound changes which have taken place in our country.

Concerned with the interests of the individual and the rights of the citizens, our party also pays proper attention to problems of strengthening social discipline and the observance by all citizens of their obligations to society, for democracy cannot be achieved without discipline and a firm public order. The responsible approach of every citizen to his obligations and the interests of the people, as was noted at the 25th CPSU Congress, provides the only reliable base for the fullest possible implementation of the principles of socialist democracy and for true individual freedom. Socialist democracy, states the Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution," is a unity of rights and obligations, true freedom and civic responsibility, and harmonious combination of the interests of society, the collective, and the individual.

The building of developed socialism enables us today to improve the constitutional provisions concerning rights and obligations. Asserting the general principle of citizens' equality, the draft of the new USSR Constitution reflects the broadened socioeconomic rights of the Soviet people, pertaining to the very foundations of their life. It emphasizes the substance of the material guarantees of such rights and formulates more fully their political rights and freedoms. The draft is based on the fact that rights and freedoms cannot and should not be used against the Soviet social system and to the detriment of the interests of the people.

I

The party has always considered the implementation of the Leninist ideas of legality and the guarantees backing it one of the decisive prerequisites for the development of socialist democracy. The CPSU considers socialist legality the most important principle governing the activities of the Soviet state. Guided by the doctrine of the great Lenin, the CPSU Central Committee, its Politburo, and Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet are tirelessly fighting for the application of the strict principles of legality in all fields of state, economic, and sociocultural life. They emphasize the creative and progressive role of the law in the building of communism. They pay daily attention to the units within the state mechanism which must directly watch over the observance of legality and block its violations.

The Leninist ideas of revolutionary socialist legality as a condition for a lasting and firm power are systematically implemented by the party. The legal system inherent in our state life and socialist democracy is one of the most important methods for the guidance of society. The party documents have frequently stressed that the strictest possible observance of the Soviet laws and their mandatory nature for all, regardless of position and rank, are considered a prime inviolable requirement of party and state discipline.

The long experience of the Soviet state shows that the more strictly we observe the stipulations of the law the more completely and successfully we can implement the party's policy which reflects the will of the people. The strict observance of the laws is not only a legal but a political, a party requirement. The violation of this requirement means a retreat from the formulated political course. The observance and implementation of the laws are equally mandatory to any citizen, and even more so to the leading workers. V. I. Lenin pointed out that a "high spirit of legality" must be an inseparable quality in the activities of any unit of the Soviet state apparatus. He demanded of the leading cadres to show a truly respectful attitude toward the laws of the Soviet system and promote their model implementation, emphasizing that every leader must provide "an example of conscientiousness and strict observance of the laws" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 37, p 480). Lenin firmly linked the establishment and strengthening of socialist legality with the development of Soviet legislation. As early as in the period of preparations for the proletarian revolution he wrote: "...The will, if it is the will of the state, must be expressed in terms of a law established by the authority..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 32, p 340).

These instructions issued by the leader of the October Revolution are being strictly implemented. The CPSU and its Central Committee pay constant attention to the improvement of Soviet legislation which, while remaining firm, stable, and accessible to all Soviet citizens, must not fall behind life and must properly and promptly reflect the processes occurring in society.

Extensive work has been done in recent years to make the legislation consistent with the new level reached by our socialist society. For example, the laws on the status of deputies of soviets of deputies of the working people, and of the basic rights and obligations of rayon and city soviets of deputies of the working people, the foundations of legislation on labor, public health, public education, marriage, and the family, laws on environmental protection, and some others are of major sociopolitical importance. In February 1977 the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium passed a number of ukases amending and supplementing criminal, criminal-procedural, and corrective-labor legislation. These ukases are aimed at the further strengthening of the socialist legal order, intensifying the struggle against antisocial actions, improving delinquency prevention work, and making effective use of punitive measures for the correction and reeducation of individuals who have committed crimes.

The Soviet laws encompass all aspects of social relations and all realms of state, economic, and cultural construction. They play an important role in the administration of social processes in our country. They create a solid base for insuring the efficient work of state organs, upgrading the responsibility of officials, protecting citizens' rights, and strengthening the discipline and order in all production and social life.

The draft of the USSR Constitution is a clear manifestation of the further strengthening of socialist law and order. Summing up the extensive work done by the CPSU and the Soviet state to improve the Soviet laws and create firm guarantees against any violations of individual rights, abuse of power, and bureaucratic distortions, the draft emphasizes that the observance of the constitution and the laws is the duty of all state organs and officials, public organizations, and citizens.

The draft stipulates that political freedoms are granted in accordance with the interests of the working people and with a view to strengthening the socialist system. Every citizen must consider that it is his responsibility to society to conscientiously fulfill his duty to the state and the people. The duties of the citizen to work honestly and conscientiously, defend the homeland, protect the interests of the Soviet state, help in the maintenance of public order, and fight theft and waste of public property assume the nature of a constitutional requirement.

The new USSR Constitution will be the base for further Soviet legislative improvements. The new constitutions of union and autonomous republics and a number of other legislative acts will be elaborated on its basis.

At the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that the adoption of the new constitution will be of exceptional importance to the life of the country. The implementation of its stipulations will raise our entire governmental and economic activity and entire work of power and administrative organs to a qualitatively new level.

The party always emphasizes that the comprehensive, multiple-level social problem of safeguarding the law and public order could be successfully resolved only through the united and coordinated efforts of party and state organs and public organizations, involving in this work all conscientious working people. We must always improve the forms of such activities and coordinate the efforts of the public and the state organs in order to create everywhere a united front of struggle against all delinquencies on the basis of the proper combination of persuasion and coercion methods.

Steadfastly implementing the Leninist ideas of the direct participation of the toiling masses in supervising the observance of legality and the establishment of nationwide supervision of antisocial elements, the CPSU is comprehensively promoting the activeness of the working people in the struggle for the further strengthening of the legal order. It is decisively directing public opinion to the struggle against delinquencies and the creation of an atmosphere of intolerance around people who violate the roles of socialist community life. "The party deems it its duty to direct the attention of our entire society to such phenomena," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "and to mobilize the people for a decisive struggle against them, and for surmounting them, for without this we shall be unable to build communism."

Unfortunately, occasionally the importance of the strict observance and implementation of Soviet laws is underestimated and attempts to "circumvent" the law and pit legality against expediency are noted. Sometimes we come across deeply erroneous and harmful views on the admissibility to violate the law under certain circumstances. This leads to the development of a scornful attitude toward individual obligations and the rights of other people, and to a tolerant attitude toward abuses. It contributes to manifestations of bureaucracy and narrow departmental and parochial trends. Such an erroneous approach also lowers the individual responsibility of the heads of administrative organs concerning legality and the strict observance of the state discipline. Wherever officials fail to display firmness and decisiveness in defending the interests of the state and the rights of the citizens, fail to adopt decisive measures to block all violations of the law and tolerate abuses, favorable grounds arise for the development of a mentality of philistine passiveness and indifference to public interests, and the energizing of private ownership, parasitical, and other antisocial trends.

Paying greater attention to the observance of the law considerably improves the effectiveness of the struggle against delinquencies and, in the final account, has a beneficial influence on the effectiveness of social production and the level of ideological work. This is confirmed, for example, by the experience of the Azerbaydzhan SSR and the Georgian SSR where a decisive struggle was launched in recent years against violations of legality and various abuses. This greatly contributed to the achievement of noteworthy successes in various sectors of the building of communism and to the energizing of social life.

The increased role of organization and discipline in all fields of the building of communism raises even further the responsibility of the legal organs of the state in insuring the observance of the laws, making such responsibility even more important. In the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "...We have paid and will continue to pay constant attention to improving the activities of the militia, the prosecution, the courts, and the justice organs watching over Soviet legality, the interests of the Soviet society, and rights of the Soviet citizens. The party and the state highly value the difficult and honorable work of the workers of such institutions. They are concerned with staffing them with trained worthy cadres." It was also pointed out that the state security organs which, under the party's guidance and tireless control, base their entire work on the strict observance of constitutional norms and socialist legality, are reliably protecting the Soviet society from subversive imperialist actions.

In circumstances in which various foreign services and centers are trying to bring to life in immature minds private ownership and other vestiges through false fabrications of "deprivation" of civil freedoms and "violations" of human rights, an intolerable attitude toward any manifestation of bourgeois ideology and the creation within every collective of circumstances

governed by high-level organization, discipline, and vigilance, which would eliminate any carelessness, is particularly important. Expressing the will of our entire people and defending its interests, the Soviet state has taken and will continue to take legally stipulated measures aimed at blocking any attempt on the part of individual renegades to engage in anti-Soviet activities.

The Soviet procuracy plays a particular role in the system for insuring legality.

The unity of the economic and political foundations of the Soviet society, and the integrated policy followed by all union republics in the building of communism determined the uniform legality of the entire Soviet state. "...Legality cannot be legality for Kaluga or Kazan' but must be identical for all Russia and even identical for the entire federation of Soviet republics..." Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 198). He called for the "absolute observance of the uniform laws passed for the entire federation." The organ which, in Lenin's view, was to implement this requirement, on behalf of the central governmental authority, was the procuracy which has the duty "to supervise the establishment of a truly uniform understanding of legality in the entire republic, regardless of local differences or despite any local influences whatever," so that "no single decision of the local authority will be inconsistent with the law" (Ibid., pp 198, 199). Lenin believed that the procuracy must not depend on the local power organs and must obey only the center, working "under the closest possible control and most direct contact with the three party institutions which offer maximal guarantees against local or individual influences, namely: the Central Committee Organizational Bureau, the Central Committee Politburo, and the Central Control Commission..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 200).

Lenin's principles governing the organization and activities of the procuracy were fully embodied in the USSR Constitution and in the Regulation on the Prosecutor's Supervision in the USSR, adopted in 1955 by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The party's systematic course toward upgrading the role of legality, organization, and discipline at all levels and in all sectors led to a considerable energizing of the prosecutor's supervision.

The broad publicity of procuracy activities, which is an important means for linking the prosecution organs with the people and for upgrading social activeness, is based on the truly democratic nature of socialist legality. The prosecutors systematically inform the broad circles of the public on the condition of legality and on measures taken for its strengthening and for the struggle against crime. Reports submitted at sessions of soviets of deputies of the working people, and announcements on results of prosecutors' investigations of cases presented at meetings of working people's collectives and rural gatherings, speeches to the population, articles in the press, and lectures and talks on legal topics on the radio and television

have become a comprehensive and firm part of the work of the procuracies. In the past 2 years alone over 800,000 such presentations have been made. This contributes to upgrading the legal awareness of the citizens and to their education in a spirit of respect for the law and the rules of socialist community life. The prosecutors provide great help to the people's control units, the members of comrades courts, and the public prosecutors.

Particular significance is ascribed to the consideration of letters and statements by citizens who share their thoughts on the condition of legality, report violations of the laws, and submit suggestions on strengthening law and order. Letters and complaints are not only a means for exposing violations of the law and restoring violated rights but one of the important forms of participation of the working people in strengthening socialist legality.

In recent years the prosecutors have begun to see more frequently citizens directly at enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. Supervision of the observance of laws on the procedure for considering letters and petitions submitted to ministries and departments has become more active. Formalism and bureaucracy in resolving complaints and petitions submitted by the working people must be dealt with strictly, including criminal prosecution. It was for such actions, for example, that Morgovskiy, chief of the Sabir-Rakhimovskiy communications center in Tashkent, Yakovenko, chief of the housing-communal office of the Krasnoarmeyskugol' Association, Batev, deputy director of the Krasnovolzhskiy cotton fabrics combine in Ivanovskaya Oblast, and some others were sentenced.

The prosecutors always see to it that the laws are observed when state administrative organs issue legal acts. The reasons for disparities between one or another order, instruction, and decision, on the one hand, and the law, on the other, vary. The principal reasons are the poor knowledge on the part of some officials of existing legislation, omissions in the organization of the work of legal services, and insufficient control by superior management organs over the legality of decisions made by subordinate enterprises, establishments, organizations, or executive committees of local soviets. There have also been cases of so-called "arbitrary" decisions which sometimes conceal various parochial and departmental considerations and disregard of the laws.

Prosecutors appeal in legal decisions, prosecute guilty officials, and take measures to eliminate conditions which contribute to violations of the law. Recently, based on information submitted by prosecutors, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Councils of Ministers of the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Belorussian SSR, and Uzbek SSR, and many other union republics discussed the condition of the observance of the laws in the promulgation of legal acts by local soviets of deputies of the working people and by republic and local administrative organs. Based on materials submitted by the USSR Procuracy this matter was considered by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

II

One of the main lines of prosecutors' activities is to supervise the observance of the laws on the protection of socialist property and the implementation of the decisions of the 25th party congress and the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the need to maintain the strictest possible regimen of savings in all economic sectors and tirelessly control the use of material and financial resources. The decisions made by the party and the government contributed to making the protection of socialist property more active and purposeful. However, the necessary measures for intensifying the struggle against theft and other encroachments on the people's property have not as yet been taken everywhere. Not all labor collectives have developed an atmosphere of universal condemnation of those who encroach on public property. Occasionally dishonest people, even people previously sentenced for crimes of a mercenary nature are appointed to positions of responsibility regarding material values. Disregard for the preservation of material values, abuse of official position, violations of financial and state discipline, negligence, waste, and displays of "generosity" at the expense of the state also cause considerable harm.

In some ministries and departments the level of control-auditing work is low. The legal services still poorly influence the strengthening of state and planning discipline and improvements in economic activities. They do not use with sufficient energy their rights for the prompt detection and blocking of various abuses. Lenin's remarks that along with institutions which are aware of the spreading of this ill and are fighting it there are others which claim that there is no theft, that everything is proper in their entrusted department, establishment, or enterprise remain entirely topical (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 43, p 286). An irresponsible attitude toward the protection of socialist property becomes possible only when individual economic managers, including personnel of ministries and departments, underestimate the social danger of theft and manifestations of waste and do not support measures to fight them through systematic organizational and educational work.

Various types of smart dealers and swindlers try to benefit from shortcomings and omissions in economic activities, errors in planning, and unsatisfactory organization of accounting and control. In recent years large-scale thefts were exposed in the Azerbaydzhan SSR and Uzbek SSR, some oblasts of the Ukrainian SSR and the Russian Federation, and in many other areas.

Occasionally thefts are accompanied by bribing officials. Substantial public funds are acquired by individuals engaged in private enterprise activities and by work shirkers. Thus, officials from Kalinovskiy Sovkhoz, Chernushinskiy Rayon, and Permskaya Oblast paid a hired brigade 15,000 rubles to repair the cow barn--five times above the factual cost of the work. The chairman and chief bookkeeper of the Krasnyy Oktyabr' Kolkhoz, Aleksandrovskiy Rayon, Orenburgskaya Oblast, prepaid such "shirkers" some 30,000 rubles. The culprits were criminally prosecuted and sentenced.

Implementing the party's decisions on intensifying the struggle against theft, negligence, waste, and violations of state discipline, the prosecutors' organs have increased the activeness and aggressiveness of their supervision over the observance of the laws on the protection of socialist property. They control the prompt instigation and thorough investigation of all cases related to theft and waste of the people's property and take measures to stop all culprits and their accomplices and to insure their prosecution.

In many union republics materials and reports submitted by prosecutors on such matters were considered by leading party organs, presidiums of supreme soviets, and councils of ministers. Measures have been taken to strengthen relations and business contacts among procuracies, soviets of deputies of the working people, people's control organs, and other controlling institutions. The task is to improve radically the general supervisory work of the procuracies. This requires not only the exposure of violations of the law but the determination of the reasons for which such violations were not detected prior to the intervention of the prosecutor, supervision of the factual elimination of reasons and conditions contributing to thefts, negligences, and abuses, and assessing on a principled basis the inactivity of officials in charge of maintaining the proper state order, who engage in meaningless talks and formulation of measures on paper instead of factually protecting the people's property.

The task is for the efforts in this most important sector in the strengthening of law and order not to be reduced to a short campaign, and for invariably displaying political acuteness and principle-mindedness in this work, mainly in the blocking and preventing of violations of the law and of eliminating conditions contributing to thefts and negligence.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress stipulate a number of measures aimed at decisively improving the quality of all types of output by the national economy. In this connection the prosecution organs have energized their supervision over the observance of the laws directed against the production of substandard goods, considering this work one of the most important lines of their activities. For example, great attention is being paid to the quality of housing and industrial construction and the production of consumer goods.

The personnel of the procuracies systematically check enterprises, ministries, and departments. Based on the results of such investigations representations and appeals are filed and those charged with violations of the law are held disciplinarily and materially liable. If necessary, criminal laws are applied. Over a long period of time the transformers plant in Kurgan-Tyube produced substandard transformers and other items. A considerable percentage of the returned goods was not recorded and, occasionally, was simply destroyed. For such criminal activities Salikhov, the plant's director, and chief engineer Morozov were held criminally liable and were given different jail sentences by the supreme court of the Tadzhik SSR.

The most important thing is for the prosecutor's investigations to be effective and trigger a response in the public and, along with other measures, contribute to improving the quality of output.

The party and the government demand the waging of a decisive struggle against all forms of window dressing and deception of the state. They deem it necessary to consider such actions crimes against the party and the people and to dismiss and strictly prosecute the guilty officials or those who instigate them, going so far as to expel them from the party and try them. For careeristic purposes some officials embellish real conditions related to the implementation of plans and obligations. This confuses the planning and financial organs and results in losses of material values, wage over-expenditures, and illegal payment of bonuses. Padding and deceiving the state are frequently related to abuses, bribery, and theft. For example, the USSR Procuracy investigated the criminal activities of Rozenberg, director of Automotive Vehicle Enterprise No 1 in Kazan'. For a number of years he padded reports to the state for his own benefit and stole tens of thousands of rubles together with his accomplices. The criminals were sentenced to long prison terms.

However, in some places occasionally the prosecutor's supervision lacks firmness and strictness and the ability to counter attempts on the part of individual local leaders to protect the whitewashers. The task is to prevent any tolerance in this important matter and insure everywhere a statesmanlike approach on the part of the prosecutors when dealing with matters of liability for deceiving the state.

The importance of the thorough observance of state order in output deliveries and the need to combine material and moral incentives with strict penalties for violations of planning and contractual discipline was emphasized at the 25th party congress and the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Yet, there have been cases in economic practice in which enterprises and associations allow the adoption of a narrow departmental approach to the implementation of contractual obligations and are concerned above all with intrasectorial deliveries. This leads to the nonfulfillment of plans and assignments for the delivery of goods meeting all-union requirements or the requirements of other union republics, and disturbs the coordination among other economic units.

In some cases violations of the laws are related to various abuses. Thus, a group of officials within the light industry system was bribed to ship controlled scarce fabrics not to their destination. With a totally unemployed dealer as an intermediary large quantities of such fabrics were disposed of, sold to the population at higher prices, and used by smart dealers for the production of undeclared goods. The USSR Procuracy instigated criminal proceedings and took measures for the respective ministries and departments to provide proper control over the observance of stock allocation discipline.

The prosecutors pay great attention to the use of civil law measures in the struggle against negligence, waste, and violations of state discipline. Particular attention is paid to compensations for material damages caused to the state. Here we proceed on the basis of Lenin's requirements to the effect that "not a single 100-ruble note wrongly fallen into anyone's hands fail to return to the state's treasury" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 36, p 263). Prosecutors' claims filed against officials whose actions have caused material damages to the state are an effective method for such work.

An important part of the work of the procuracies, aimed at the protection of public property, is supervision over the observance of environmental protection laws. The prosecutors prosecute individuals who display a negligent attitude toward the land, timber, and subsoil, and who pollute the water, the soil, and the air. The increasingly topical matter of environmental protection demands of the organs of the prosecution to pay increased attention to them.

The question of the struggle against losses of working time and idling, rushing, and labor discipline violations was raised sharply at the 25th party congress. In his speech at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev also emphasized that "...The closest possible attention should be paid to the condition of the labor discipline. We still have too much absenteeism, lateness, and idling. This is a great evil as a result of which millions of man/days are lost. All party organizations, the entire public, must rise to the struggle against it."

Materials based on the prosecutors' supervision show that the legal means for strengthening production discipline and order are underestimated by many enterprises and organizations. Occasionally some officials wink at the violators of labor discipline who are left unpunished. Furthermore, some managers, relying only on the force of disciplinary penalties, underestimate the educational importance of measures of social influence and do not submit materials on absenteeists and loafers to comrades courts.

The procuracy focuses its attention on the observance of labor legislation. Measures are taken so that the means used in the prosecutors' supervision contribute to upgrading the responsibility of superior administrative organs, ministries, departments, and officials for the observance of labor laws. Characteristic shortcomings were found by the procuracy within the system of the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry. Many of its enterprises failed to take effective measures to strengthen the labor discipline and make effective use of the working time. The struggle against absenteeism and drunkenness at work was waged poorly. Laws protecting the labor of women and young people were violated. However, the ministry failed to exercise proper control over the factual elimination of such violations. Based on a presentation made by the USSR Procuracy, the ministry and the trade union Central Committee took measures to insure the observance of labor legislation.

A more extensive use of data based on prosecutors' investigations by mass information media, the press above all, would contribute to drawing the attention of the public to the preservation of the people's property and the struggle against manifestations of negligence and violations of state and labor discipline. Unfortunately, despite the obviously topical nature of such problems, many press organs still deal with them infrequently.

III

The most important problem in strengthening legality is the struggle against crime. The party has always approached its assessment of crime as an anti-social phenomenon from class-political positions. Steadily improving the material living conditions of the people and upgrading their cultural standard and conscientiousness, the socialist society is creating all the necessary conditions for the eradication of crime. That is precisely why its steady decline is inherent in socialism. In the past 50 years the number of convictions has declined several hundred percent despite a considerable increase in population. Professional crime has been eliminated. Particularly dangerous state crimes and cases of banditry have become isolated occurrences.

However, the process of the elimination of crime does not develop spontaneously and automatically. Under our circumstances it depends to a decisive degree on the extent to which the struggle with the types of negative phenomena which could lead to crime and, under certain circumstances, become their specific reason, and, above all, against the various types of antisocial behavior is waged systematically and purposefully.

Along with dealing firmly with crimes which have already been committed, the main attention has been focused on crime prevention. Life convincingly proves that most frequently crimes and other violations become possible wherever educational work with the people has been poorly organized and wherever an atmosphere of intolerance toward a loose life, lack of discipline, violations of the rules governing socialist community life, drunkenness, parasitism, and unconscientious attitude toward labor has not been created, and wherever a philistine mentality and indifference toward the public interest have not been firmly rebuffed.

Currently the help of the public is extensively used in the eradication of crime and the prevention of legal violations. The comrades courts, the voluntary people's units, and the people's control groups and posts play an important role. However, not all social organizations or collectives of working people make full use of their possibilities and obligations to prevent delinquencies, to reform and reeducate delinquents, to control their behavior, and to mobilize public opinion against any deviation from socialist morality norms. Criminality and all forms of antisocial behavior constitute a social ill which must be fought daily, firmly, and decisively, making full use of the opinion of the labor collective, press criticism, methods of persuasion, and the power of the law, or all means at our disposal.

The party demands of the administrative organs to engage in a persistent and tireless struggle against criminality and to coordinate their activities, relying on the public.

The most important condition for the successful eradication and prevention of crime is the inevitability of punishment. This requires the prompt and full exposure of all crimes, so that no single crime may remain unexposed and no single criminal may avoid punishment. Essentially, the impunity of criminals encourages them to commit new crimes and rouses the justifiable censure of the citizens.

Intensifying the supervision over the detection of crimes is the prime duty of the procuracy. Great attention is paid to the observance of the law on reacting promptly and correctly to each statement of or report on the commission of a crime. Of late such supervision has become more thorough and effective and has contributed to energizing the struggle against the faulty practice of leaving crime unreported. Basic attention is being ascribed to intensifying control over the observance of the laws on the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism which account for nearly one-half of all crimes, including nearly all manifestations of hooliganism, and many dangerous crimes against the life, health, and property of the citizens.

The procuracy pays particular attention to supervision of the precise observance of the laws governing the rights and obligations of adolescents. Here the emphasis is on the initiative and activeness of the prosecutors in formulating and resolving the basic problems related to this matter and on the close contacts and coordination of measures among the procuracy and all other state organs directly involved in the affairs of minors and the public organizations.

Supervision over the observance of the law in meting out justice is an important aspect of procuracy work. The prosecutors prosecute most of the criminal cases tried in court, including nearly all cases related to most dangerous crimes. They are guided by Lenin's instruction of the need to formulate charges sensibly, accurately, and within limits. It is important to make more effective use of the courts in creating an atmosphere of universal condemnation of people who violate the law so that a trial may always be a school for promoting respect for the law, and so that, as Lenin taught, "lessons of public morality and practical politics" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 4, pp 407-408) may be derived from each court case.

There is perhaps no single area of social relations, all of which are controlled by laws, with which the procuracy organs are not involved. The responsible nature of their obligations in the strengthening of legality and the variety of problems which they handle dictate at all times the need to upgrade further the level of procuracy activities. In order for procuracy measures to be most effective they must continue to be directed toward the solution of the most important key problems of the building of communism and be an organic link within the overall system of measures taken by the party and the state to strengthen legality.

Supervising and drafting measures, the procuracy takes into consideration the obligations of the other state organs in the field of insuring legality and promotes the efficient interaction between prosecutors and soviets of deputies of the working people, and people's control organs. The main thing is to achieve coordination of actions and a uniform governmental approach in insuring legality everywhere, and to make use of the increased activeness of the Soviet people and their lively participation in strengthening law and order.

Promoting an overall considerable amount of work in supervising the observance of the laws, the procuracy workers are clearly aware of the need to radically upgrade the effectiveness of procuracy activities. At the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that the new constitution must result in considerable improvements in the work of the organs entrusted with insuring the strict observance of the stipulations of Soviet laws--the procuracy, courts, arbitration authorities, other administrative institutions, and people's control. He emphasized that "The party expects of all these organs even greater initiative, principledness, and intolerance in the struggle against all violations of Soviet law."

A great deal remains to be done to improve the coordination of actions taken by administrative organs and to surmount occasional underestimation of the role of their cooperation with the public. The tasks facing the procuracy require the steady improvement of its activities, the search for new approaches and new solutions, and high responsibility for assignments. Party exactingness must always determine the style of our work.

The effectiveness of procuracy work depends to a decisive extent on organizing the work with cadres. The procuracy organs employ politically mature and skilled people able to implement their assignments successfully. At the same time, our organs are always reinforced by young workers whose training and upbringing are of prime significance.

Demanding of the cadres high political conscientiousness, initiative, and competence in the solution of professional problems, we try to get rid of people whose business and political qualities make them unsuitable for work in the procuracy organs.

In their greeting to the personnel of the Soviet procuracy in connection with the 50th anniversary of its establishment, the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers pointed out that from the very first days of their existence our procuracy organs have been firmly watching over the great accomplishments of socialism and have actively promoted the party's policy of strengthening socialist legality and order. Its personnel have carried out responsible assignments in protecting the rights and legitimate interests of the working people and of state and public organizations, contributing with all their activities to the upbringing of the Soviet people in the spirit of the lofty principles of communist morality, and respect for the laws and rules of socialist community life.

Implementing the historical decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress, the personnel of the Soviet procuracy, which enjoys the great trust of the people, will struggle even more adamantly against all violations of the laws in order to make their worthy contribution to the building of communism.

5003

CSO: 1802

NUCLEUS OF OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 69-71

[Article by A. Zhabagina, party committee secretary at the Alma-Ata cotton fabrics combine imeni 50-Letiya Oktyabr'skoy Revolyutsii]

[Text] Article 6 of the draft of the new USSR Constitution legislatively codifies the role of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of our society and as the nucleus of its political system and of all state and public organizations. It stipulates that the CPSU guides the great constructive activities of the Soviet people and gives a systematic and scientifically substantiated nature to its struggle for the victory of communism. Armed with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, our party determines the general long-term development of society and formulates the line followed in USSR domestic and foreign policy.

This article includes words expressing the very essence of our party: "The CPSU exists for the people and serves the people." The working people of our Alma-Ata cotton fabrics combine imeni 50-Letiya Oktyabr'skoy Revolyutsii spoke of the party and of the fact that it is honorably justifying its noble purpose of leading society on the path earmarked by V. I. Lenin, the great genius of mankind, at meetings and party and workers' gatherings. They were held following the publication of the decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum and of the outstanding and impressive report presented at the plenum by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Constitutional Commission, on the submission of the draft of the new constitution to nationwide discussion. As all Soviet people, the combines workers, engineering and technical personnel, and employees unanimously supported and approved these historical documents. They proudly spoke of the achievements of our country, of the Soviet way of life, and of the fact that the draft of the new constitution reflects the beneficial socioeconomic changes which have taken place in our society under the leadership of the CPSU since the adoption of the 1936 constitution.

I recall the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the ceremony on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Second Congress of the RSDWP. Assessing the distance covered under the party's guidance, Leonid Il'ich noted that the party was on the level of its tasks and was able to lay previously unknown roads from capitalism to socialism. Gaining the boundless faith of the working class and all working people, it was able to create a developed socialist society and a state of the whole people, and take the biggest country in the world to the main road of the building of communism.

At the present stage our socialist state faces new and more complex and broad tasks. The party is doing everything to mobilize the energy of the Soviet people for the implementation of the decisions of the 25th congress and the assignments of the 10th Five-Year Plan. In this connection we must improve further the party's leadership of economic construction. We know that providing such leadership the party uses its specific and tried ways and means of work. Without replacing the economic management organs, enterprise administrations, or mass organizations of the working people, it is promoting the steady growth of the country's economic and defense power, increased production effectiveness, and work quality in all economic sectors. Relying on its local committees and primary party organizations, the CPSU influences matters in all big and small labor collectives.

Our combine offers a good example of this. It is only 11 years old and our collective is young: the average age of the personnel is 21-22. Yet, a great deal has been accomplished within that time! The combine's capacities expanded rapidly. Currently it has a daily output of 60 tons of yarn, and 700,000 linear meters of raw and finished fabrics; the goods are shipped to all fraternal Soviet republics. Good working, training, and living conditions have been created for the combine's workers. This year alone the textile workers will acquire a new beautiful palace of culture, a Pioneers camp, their 11th comfortable community house, and a kindergarten which will be added to the 7 children's combines already established.

The party committee which the party members in our enterprise have entrusted me to head, directs the efforts of the working people to further progress in the implementation of the plans for the economic and social development of the collective. The party committee initiated a republic competition giving a collective the right to be called high effectiveness and quality enterprise, an initiative approved by the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee. Frankly stated, we did not find it simple to decide to take such a step under the conditions of a recently established collective. Nevertheless, the experience acquired in the Ninth Five-Year Plan gave us the confidence that we could resolve such a problem. Many things had to be weighed and thought about. We are convinced, for example, that our further successes will contribute to the movement of multiple-loom workers which has become widespread in our enterprise and which has been headed by party members such as L. Kochetova, state prize laureate of the Kazakh SSR and member of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee, assistant foreman A. Kuanyshbayev, winder Z. Tusakova, and others. In the Ninth

Five-Year Plan the multiple-loom operators saved 548,000 rubles. In the past 2 years alone 390 people were released, greatly needed to operate newly installed equipment, thanks to their efforts. In accordance with the comprehensive plan for technical retooling, in recent years we have installed 306 units of modern technological equipment. This enabled us to increase output and variety. We have been able to resolve in the main other key problems of upgrading production effectiveness and to reach an effective work rhythm.

Last year the party committee considered at one of its meetings the question of improving further the combine's work and upgrading the vanguard role of the party members in the development of the socialist competition. The question was then submitted for discussion at a general party meeting. After the meeting workers, engineers, and factory and section managers came to the party committee to submit specific suggestions on the use of production reserves. It became clear that with the necessary backing such suggestions would help the collective and the individual workers to substantiate and then implement higher socialist obligations while the combine's 10th Five-Year Plan assignments would be overfulfilled. This was the direction followed in the work with the active participation of all shop party organizations and party groups. The results were that the production program for the first half of this year was overfulfilled for all basic technical and economic indicators.

Now, in the course of the discussion of the decisions of the May plenum and the draft of the constitution, even more successful work is being done. A total of 100 brigades and over 1,200 leading production workers have given their firm worker's word to fulfill two annual norms by the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Komsomol-youth brigade No 71 took up labor duties dedicated to the great anniversary. Party members and cadre workers are helping them to fulfill their pledges.

Managing the economy and our entire economic construction remains the party's main concern. This is not directly mentioned in article 6 of the draft of the constitution even though it is based on a more general statement. Therefore, we believe that the fundamental law of our state should mention the party's guidance of the economy and the fact that the party formulates economic strategy and policy and continually controls their implementation.

5003

CSO: 1802

MAIN SOCIAL NUCLEUS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 71-73

[Article by M. Dzilyuma, automatic machines tuner at the relays shop of the VEF plant and delegate to the 16th congress of USSR trade unions, Riga]

[Text] Dear KOMMUNIST editors! I would like to share with you my thoughts after reading the draft of the USSR Constitution.

I recalled, above all, the opening of the 16th congress of USSR trade unions. At that time all of us delegates to the congress--party and nonparty members like myself--were particularly solemn and excited. Not only because the congress was beginning its work but also because it was addressed then by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev. I am certain that every one of the delegates found in the speech by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary words which seemed directly addressed to him. I, for example, thought that it would be outstanding if all the problems he mentioned could be resolved at our enterprise. Naturally, we have already resolved some of them but others remain. I am confident, however, that in 1 to 1 1/2 years our collective will please the homeland and the party with new successes.

I particularly remember Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's statement that in addition to good management "from above" our society has yet another powerful force for the acceleration of economic growth--the creative activeness and initiative of millions of people "from below." Such initiative and direct participation of the broadest popular masses in production management and social development is the first characteristic of the democratic nature of developed socialism. The draft of the new USSR Constitution contains many articles stipulating the further democratization of our society.

I believe that in this sense article 16 is particularly important. It discusses the role of labor collectives in resolving important socio-economic problems facing the Soviet people. The very fact that this article has been included in the draft of the constitution proves the systematic implementation of the party's main line aimed at the further development of democratic principles in production management.

Any labor collective--whether big or small--is a powerful force. Let us take as an example the brigade in which I work. It stands at the very beginning of a long technological chain for the production of relays for direct dialing telephone exchanges. We have a united collective and the brigade has almost no turnover. The workers' grades are high. Many of them have worked for 15-20 years. Production conditions are improving steadily. When I came to the sector, 24 years ago, the operations were manual. Today the process has become almost totally automated.

However, I would like to mention something else. The reliability of the relays and of the entire VEF automated telephone exchange largely depends on the way we work, and on the quality of output of our sector. It is understandable, therefore, that the collective is greatly concerned with quality. Yet, quality is improving slowly. This is due to a number of reasons, both technological and, if one may say so, human. For example, should the fitters section repair a die improperly we are unable to produce proper quality goods. Therefore, this would affect the other links in the technological chain. Actually, today one could speak only in conventional terms about the "chain" itself: the technologically related sections are not side-by-side but on different floors. A great deal of time is lost in hauling semifinished goods and parts, and parts are frequently damaged on the way... All this is due to flaws in the organization of output. However, other factors are added to such "objective" shortcomings. For example, some shop workers can be seen in the section only during "quality day," while at any other time they must be sought after and such searches are not always effective.

All this greatly concerns the collective. At their meetings the workers have frequently pointed out the need to reorganize the work and improve the organization of the technological process. Such statements on the activities of the collective were useful. This spring a commission was set up now planning a new system for the location of the various shop sections. They will be placed in such a way as to eliminate unnecessary haulage and moving of parts. This will not only reduce the time spent in moving the parts along the technological chain but will remove the risk of breaking relays. We are also thinking now of launching a competition for a worker's quality guarantee.

Naturally, however, such competition will yield results only if the entire collective and all its members become profoundly and completely imbued with a spirit of high responsibility for our assignment. This will occur only when the collective itself begins to educate its members even more actively. We know, for example, that a careless worker will take far more seriously a discussion at a brigade meeting than the criticism of the shop's or section's management. For this reason we try to cope ourselves with all unpleasant cases as the results are far better.

Yes, the socialist labor collective is not only an important link in the production chain. Numerous facts of daily life indicate that it is the most important social nucleus whose development and operations determine the

entire course of development of Soviet socialist society. The collective greatly influences the molding of the character of a person, developing in him new communist features such as, for example, the responsibility of the individual worker not only for his personal affairs but for the affairs of the entire collective and the entire production process. Such features also include friendship, internationalism, and comradely mutual aid which have become an indivisible aspect of the socialist way of life.

In recent years the party's Central Committee has repeatedly pointed out the growing role of the labor collective in Soviet society. Suffice it to recall the CPSU Central Committee decrees "On the Participation of Managing and Engineering and Technical Workers of the Cherepovets Metallurgical Plant in the Ideological-Political Education of the Members of the Collective," and "On the Work of the Party Organization of the Minsk Tractors Plant to Upgrade the Production and Sociopolitical Activeness of the Labor Collective." The development of labor collectives could be considered with full justification a nationwide task based on the main objective--the building of a communist society.

It is naturally a very good thing that in accordance with the draft of the USSR Constitution the collective is being granted greater rights in the solution of most important socioeconomic problems. In my view, however, article 16 should mention not only rights but obligations as well. Therefore, I suggest that the following addition be made to article 16 of the draft of the USSR Constitution: "The collectives of working people must develop socialist competition--one of the most important conditions for the economic progress of the USSR. The collectives must educate their members in a spirit of loyalty to the interests of the party, the homeland, and the people, and develop in every working person new communist features."

I am convinced that including in the USSR Constitution such stipulations will upgrade even further the responsibility of both collectives and individual workers for the further successful and dynamic development of the socialist society.

5003

CSO: 1802

CIVIC DUTY OF THE SOVIET SOLDIERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 74-75

[Article by Hero of the Soviet Union Rear Adm N. Usenko]

[Text] The navy personnel have warmly responded to the decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum. They accepted the draft of the new USSR Constitution elaborated by the Constitutional Commission chaired by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary, with profound approval and unanimous support. These days every one of my fellow servicemen is experiencing profound patriotic feelings.

We are profoundly pleased by the fact that the draft of the USSR Constitution includes a special chapter which legislatively codifies for the first time the peaceful principles of Leninist foreign policy. The draft of the fundamental law particularly emphasizes the fact that the efforts of the socialist state are directed toward insuring the successful building of communism in the USSR, strengthening the world socialist system, and safeguarding the peace on earth.

In those circumstances the Soviet armed forces are an important instrument for peace. They have been called upon to fulfill one of the most important functions of the Soviet state--the defense of socialist gains. Life itself and the 60 years of history of our country convincingly prove the need to be on guard, and to protect the defense capability of our country, to use V. I. Lenin's words.

We, military servicemen, realize the great responsibility which is entrusted to us by the USSR Constitution. To defend the Soviet homeland is an honorable obligation and a sacred duty. In the case of military cadres this is also an honorable profession of which we are proud.

Currently, discussing the draft of the USSR Constitution, we express our filial gratitude to our Communist Party and the Soviet people for their constant attention and tremendous concern for improving and strengthening the combat power of the armed forces. The stipulation in the draft of the

fundamental law to the effect that "The state insures the security and defense capability of the country and supplies the USSR armed forces with everything necessary" can be tangibly seen in all our accomplishments.

Let us take the navy as an example. Like the other branches of the armed forces, it has the most modern combat equipment. Seeing the fleets and participating in cruises, one unwittingly feels pride in the powerful battle-ships, their perfect combat materiel, sophisticated instruments, and powerful weapons which, in the skillful hands of the Soviet people, guarantee high combat readiness and a crushing resistance to any aggressor.

Today the navy is sailing the oceans. Ships bearing the navy flag of the country of the October Revolution are sailing along all the latitudes of the world's oceans and visiting hundreds of foreign ports. The sole purpose of such friendly visits and stops is to strengthen the friendship among peoples and reciprocal trust, and to contribute to the development of extensive international cooperation.

Today, on the eve of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, it is particularly pleasing to note the features which distinguish the Soviet seamen from the military personnel of the capitalist countries. They have earned the sympathies of the citizens of the countries visited by our ships with their behavior, high culture, and neat appearance. As children of the great Soviet people who built a developed socialist society, and of a country whose constitution guarantees broad democratic rights, they are well aware of their political purpose and class tasks. They actively participate in the country's social life. As in any country in a socialist state the army cannot be removed from politics.

Our seamen remember meetings with Chilean seamen when the training ship Esmeralda visited Vladivostok in 1972. We remember how, asked to speak of political life in their country, the Chilean officers avoided our eyes and voiced the cliché that "The army is not involved in politics." These words were repeated by the Chilean seamen as well. We now know the high price which the Chilean people paid for such a "nonclass" position taken by the armed forces.

Our Soviet seamen are equal members of the Soviet society. The civil rights of every one of them are guaranteed. The over 2 million-strong army of deputies includes many members of the navy. It includes experienced admirals who have gone through the crucible of the war, young officers, petty officers, and enlisted men. That is why we understand particularly well the stipulations in the draft of the USSR Constitution aimed at the further expansion and intensification of socialist democracy.

The navy is a young organism which is constantly renovating itself. The average age of ship and submarine crews is 20-25. Today people who were born during the time of victories won in the Great Patriotic War are commanding navy ships and heading responsible sectors of party-political

work. As we know, the draft of the USSR Constitution stipulates that as of the age of 18 people have the right to be elected to the supreme organs of state power. We accept this stipulation of the draft of the fundamental law as proof of the party's trust in the Soviet youth.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that the navy personnel are a big multinational family living with the single aspiration of making our socialist fatherland more powerful.

In answer to the constant concern shown by the Communist Party and the Soviet people, the military personnel assure the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo and, personally, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, Central Committee general secretary, and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, of their constant readiness to dedicate all their forces to strengthening the combat power of the Soviet armed forces and carry out honorably their civic duty for the defense of the socialist fatherland and the gains of socialism.

5003

CSO: 1802

INCREASED ROLE OF INFORMATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 75-85

[Article by V. Vinogradov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Scientific Information for the Social Sciences]

[Text] The great socioeconomic problems resolved by the Soviet people under the guidance of the Communist Party, and the increased scale of the building of communism are directly linked with the development of Marxist-Leninist theoretical thinking and of the social sciences in our country. The 25th CPSU Congress reemphasized the tremendous significance of these sciences as a theoretical foundation for the management of economic and social processes.

This year--the year of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution--will be marked by new works written by Soviet social scientists on the universal-historical significance of this victory of the proletariat under the leadership of the Leninist party, and to the outstanding changes in all fields of life achieved in our country under the Soviet system.

Upgrading the quality and effectiveness of social production in all sectors, including scientific activities, has become now the most important task in the building of communism. The successful solution of this problem is closely linked with providing the scientists with up-to-date information on new results, ideas, and theories.

"The practical application of new scientific ideas today is a no less important task than the elaboration of such ideas," emphasized Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the 25th congress. This basic stipulation applies to the scientific information organs as well, as their effectiveness determines the utilization of scientific achievements in all social practical work and in science itself.

The question of improving the information system becomes particularly topical today because of the headlong growth of the scale of research and the drastic increase in the flow of specialized publications.

The function of information in the field of the social sciences lies, above all, in the choice and selective dissemination of information on new and most valuable research by Marxist scientists. Its purpose is to contribute to the intensification and expansion of work based on Marxist-Leninist methodology and provide data for the scientific criticism of bourgeois concepts, reformism, and revisionism.

Nature of Information Work in the Social Sciences

The development of information activities as a new independent line within the social sciences became a mandatory prerequisite for their further progress. Information in a given area has its specific nature determined both by the characteristics of such sciences as well as their interconnection reflecting an objective interconnection among factual phenomena. With the development of human knowledge research becomes more specialized and, correspondingly, the humanities become differentiated. This contributes to the detailed study of the individual aspects of social life. However, an opposite trend is equally active--the synthesizing of scientific knowledge. This appears in the interpenetration and reciprocal enrichment of the individual scientific sectors and in the development of new promising directions stemming from their points of conversions.

We should also bear in mind the fact that scientific concepts related to topical problems of socioeconomic development, spiritual processes, and ideological and political life in society are complex. Whether it is a question of laws governing the building of socialism and communism, the socioeconomic aspects of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution, national problems, mass democratic movements, the general crisis of capitalism, or international relations, their study calls for approaches based on philosophical, economic, sociological, historical, legal, and other viewpoints. In the final account, in studying social processes, Marxist-Leninist methodology calls for the specific historical consideration of the research targets. Therefore, the task of information is not merely the noting of a given fact, event, or social concept, but, to a certain extent, the interpretation of it. Even though a synopsis (as a basic method in the information system) is not a review, the scientific nature of the synopsis of a monograph, article, and so on, necessarily means a description of the method used in the considered concept and its historical position (based not only on the material of the given source but on information concerning the author and his works).

Information flows provide us with information on various trends of social development, social currents, and political phenomena. In other words, essentially they reflect all social life. Such information cannot be politically neutral. Hence the task is to determine the class positions of

the authors by comprehensively studying published data. This is not a formal requirement, for the class position of the author determines the scientific level of his theory, his social concept, and the extent of the objectivity with which he reflects reality.

The completeness of information is particularly important in the social sciences. V. I. Lenin insisted on this in his work "Statistics and Sociology:" "...We must try to establish the type of base consisting of accurate and unquestionable facts on which one could rely...If this is to be truly a base we must consider not the individual facts but the totality of facts related to the problem under consideration without a single exception..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, pp 350-351). The workers within the information system for the social sciences must bring to light anything valuable in the statistical, historical, or other data they process, including works of authors who stand on erroneous methodological positions but have acquired important factual data of cognitive value.

Yet one more characteristic exists. In the social sciences retrospective information plays a major role. As a rule, the social scientist must look over and study a great deal of works published over many years. In order to understand the nature of social phenomena and study the changes occurring in the political life of one or another society or clarify the reasons for the disappearance or appearance of different bourgeois theories, he cannot be limited merely to the latest works published on the problem he is interested in or working on. Quite frequently he must go back to its origins. This would be difficult to achieve without the help of the information organs and, should it be a question of publications in several languages, simply impossible.

Finally, there is another essential aspect. Monographs are the basic carriers of new developments in the social sciences. In the natural sciences things are different: new and important information is published mainly in articles as the brevity of the natural scientific language makes this possible. Therefore, whereas bibliographic editions related to the social sciences contain information of both books and articles, publications of abstracts give preference to books.

The complexity and responsibility of information activities in the social sciences are obvious. These sciences are the arena of a sharp ideological struggle. A strict selection of the truly valuable and truly scientific works is necessary in the tremendous flow of works on social problems published today throughout the world. This is no simple task. Tens of thousands of pseudoscientific books and articles are published in the capitalist countries. Theological literature is disseminated in mass editions. Mysticism, various types of speculations based on the topical problems of the scientific and technical revolution, and so on, are being discussed evermore extensively. All this calls for stricter requirements of the quality of the work of scientific information services.

Social Science Information Centers

In recent years, in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree on measures to improve scientific information in the social sciences (1968) extensive work has been done in the country. Last five-year plan a subsystem of social science information appeared and developed along with the natural scientific and technical subsystems. It included two all-union organs, eight sectorial centers, regional information centers, and a considerable network of information departments of scientific institutions in the field of the humanities, and in the VUZ's.

The Institute for Scientific Information on the Social Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences (INION) plays a central role among them. It has been entrusted with the coordination of all information work conducted in the country in the social sciences. The institute's collective provides information on all social science publications issued in the USSR and abroad.

The All-Union Scientific and Technical Information Center collects and disseminates information on scientific reports and dissertations.

Sectorial information organs have been set up in the fields of higher education, culture and arts, technical-vocational education, price setting, monetary circulation and credit, law, statistics, education, and archives. Each of them must act strictly within the range of its competence, in close interaction with the all-union organs.

The majority of union republics have regional organs--centers (departments, sectors) of scientific information for the social sciences within the academies of sciences of Azerbaydzhan, Armenia, Belorussia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirgiziya, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Turkmeniya, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, and Estonia. Their main task is to collect, scientifically process, and store information on problems which interest above all scientific institutions and party and state organs in the republic; the timely supply of copies of published works by republic scientists for the publication of synopses by the USSR Academy of Sciences INION. They must also coordinate and sum up experience in information work within their area.

Unfortunately, the establishment and development of information organs in a number of academies of sciences of union republics has been greatly delayed. This adversely affects the supply of information data needed by scientific workers and social scientists-teachers. The existing information organs are not given the necessary support by republic presidiums of academies of sciences and councils of ministers, particularly when it is a question of meeting their needs for duplication and electronic equipment, without which the effective work of information organs today is impossible. Another ripe problem is that of giving a number of regional information organs the status of autonomous scientific institutions.

The primary network of information organs for the social sciences began to develop on the basis of information departments, sectors, and groups in the humanities institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the academies of sciences of union republics, and the sectorial scientific research institutes and VUZ's. So far there are only about 100 of them. However, the establishment of such organs is continuing.

The scientific information centers must become an organic part of the "spiritual output" structure on a national scale. Their scientific personnel must become full members of research collectives. They must possess extensive knowledge in their field as well as in information activities methods. Their functions include the study of received publications and the selection of works most important for further information processing (based on the work plans of scientific institutions and the requirements of party and state organs), the preparation of synopses, problem-topic collections, analytical surveys, and bibliographic indices which would direct the attention of the researchers to the latest works, trends, and directions in the social sciences--to anything which could influence their scientific work.

The current system of information institutions developed in our country is organizationally interconnected and able to meet the information requirements of Soviet social scientists on the proper level.

System of Information Social Science Publications

The system of information publications is the most important prerequisite for providing the social sciences with basic data. It must satisfy to the maximal extent the needs of the scientists for the required information. It must be operative and accurate. This can be achieved if each information organ has its own "sector" and does precisely the type of work it can do better than the others.

Such a system includes periodical and other publications of broad interest to all social scientists in our country and other socialist countries, as well as publications of a selective nature aimed at one or another group of scientists or specialists working on a specific topic, or personnel of the party and state apparatus.

The journals of abstracts of the USSR Academy of Sciences INION OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V SSSR and OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI ZA RUBEZHOM play a central role in the system of information publications. They systematically inform the scientific workers, VUZ teachers, personnel of party organs and state institutions, lecturers, and propagandists of the latest achievements of Marxist-Leninist thinking, the works of progressive foreign scientists, and the conditions and trends of development of bourgeois social science with its contradictions and crises. The journal OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V SSSR is issued in seven series: "Problems of Scientific Communism," "Economics," "Philosophical Sciences," "State and

Law," "History," "Linguistics," and "Literature." The journal OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI ZA RUBEZHOM has two additional series: "Oriental and African Studies," and "Study of Science."

Currently the institute reviews publications issued in over 30 foreign languages. The editors of each of the series of the journal of abstracts try to include the most essential features of the most interesting works in their briefest and most accurate form. Thus the synopsis is not only a "signal" but a carrier of meaningful information as well. ✓

The social sciences in our country are the theoretical base in the management of social development. Therefore, the significance of the journals of abstracts is greater than that of satisfying the requirements of scientific associates and teachers. Thus, the "Economics" series is of interest also to the personnel of the national economic management system. The series "State and Law" has a big readership among practical workers in the fields of the law, justice, and public order, as well as in many state institutions. The series "Problems of Scientific Communism," "Philosophical Sciences," and "Study of Science," contain useful information for natural scientists, engineers, technicians, and administrative workers. The "History," "Literature," and "Linguistics" series are useful to cultural and education workers; the "Oriental and African Studies" series offers extensive information to anyone interested in the complex processes currently occurring in Asian and African countries.

The scientific associates of INION are steadily upgrading the quality of their output. Recently they decided to include in the reference journals a greater number of synopses, improve the selection, reduce the time between the publication of a book and of its synopsis, and so on. The latter is particularly important as operativeness in information work must improve steadily, and a great deal remains to be done by INION in this respect.

Under contemporary conditions signaling bibliographic information becomes particularly important. INION publishes 28 monthly bibliographic indices covering the basic sectors of the social sciences: 7 deal with Soviet literature, and 7 others deal with foreign publications; the others contain information of a comprehensive or country-by-country nature (including problems of development of the socialist countries, the international workers movement, and economic, political, and cultural processes in Asian and African countries). To this effect the institute subscribes to publications from 115 countries and exchanges publications with 1,557 scientific institutions and libraries in 66 countries. The annual set of these 28 indices contains information on 250,000 to 270,000 books and articles. There is no more complete bibliographic edition on the social sciences in the world.

We must note at this point the groundlessness of bourgeois propaganda attempts to present matters as though the scientists in our country are hindered in obtaining information on new foreign ideas and studies. In reality, virtually all scientifically significant works by foreign authors become familiar to Soviet social science specialists.

Problem-topic information is added to the selective abstract and very complete bibliographic information. This is achieved by the publication of problem-topic abstract and bibliographic collections and analytical surveys of scientific publications.

All basic trends in the social sciences are represented in INION. This enables it to provide rapidly information of a comprehensive and conceptual nature covering a broad range of problems, and note new phenomena in the development of the social sciences abroad.

On the occasion of the 25th CPSU Congress the institute prepared information publications on the following topics: "Successes of the Soviet Peace Program," "The Contribution of the USSR to Mankind's Social Progress," "On the Results of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," "The Complex Program for Socialist Economic Integration in Action," and "Problems of Socialist Production Effectiveness."

This year all of the institute's planned information work will be closely related to the basic concepts of the documents of the 25th CPSU Congress. Numerous abstract-economic problems of the developed socialist society, the socialist way of life, the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the struggle waged by the USSR for peace, the situation of the working class in the capitalist countries and its antimonopolistic struggle, criticism by foreign Marxists of bourgeois concepts of the historical process, and others will be published.

The institute has systematically published reference and bibliographic information editions on a number of basic works of major ideological significance on which collectives of scientists are at work. They include the multiple-volume works "History of World War II. 1939-1945," "The International Workers Movement. Problems of History and Theory," and "History of the Socialist Economy of the USSR."

INION's system of signaling and retrospective abstract and bibliographic editions are supplemented by sectorial and regional information. This includes periodical and topic editions issued by the central sectorial organs and republic information centers for social sciences. Thus, the Information Center for Problems of Culture and Art collects, publishes, and disseminates information on the following topics: general problems of culture and cultural construction in the USSR and abroad, theory and history of art, graphic art, music, choreography, theater, cultural-educational work, museum work, and restoration and preservation of cultural monuments and artistic values. The center issues abstract collections, surveys, and

bibliographic and express information publications covering all these areas. The all-union and republic ministries and regional culture administrations and culture and art specialists are supplied with all types of information.

The information center provides methodical guidance to the culture and art information organs set up by republic libraries and other cultural institutions.

The realm of competence of a republic center could be described by taking the TsNION of the Azerbaydzhan SSR Academy of Sciences Presidium. Describing its activities, let us name above all the study and summation of Soviet and foreign publications in the field of studies of Azerbaydzhan and of scientific, socioeconomic, and political problems of the Middle and Near Eastern countries. An important aspect of the center's activities is to provide abstracts on scientific publications issued in the republic on the social sciences with the subsequent publication of such information in INION's journal of abstracts OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI V SSSR. The information prepared by the center and obtained from INION is put at the disposal of the republic's scientific institutions, departments of higher educational institutions, and state and public organs. The center publishes abstract collections, surveys, and indices of publications. Some of them are prepared jointly with INION and the Armenian and Georgian information centers.

Therefore, sectorial and regional abstract and bibliographic information covers publications not included in the all-union information editions. However, some of these publications could be of all-union significance such as, for example, the publications of the Information Center on Problems of Culture and Art, publications pertaining to higher education or pedagogy, and publications by republic centers covering some foreign areas.

Other major bibliographic centers in the field of the social sciences are the USSR State Library imeni V. I. Lenin, the State Public Library imeni M. Ye. Saltykov-Shchedrin, the All-Union State Foreign Literature Library, the RSFSR State Public Historical Library, and some others. Thus, the All-Union State Foreign Literature Library publishes an information bulletin entitled "Contemporary Literature Abroad," and "Teaching of Foreign Languages," a bibliographic indicator of new foreign publication entries; together with the Information Center for Problems of Culture and Art it publishes scientific abstract collections and express information on library science and bibliography; in addition to its periodicals, the library systematically publishes bibliographic works.

This the first time that a system of such information publications has been created in our country. No such system of similar scale in terms of scale and types of publications may be found elsewhere. The system was developed on the basis of the close interaction between the information organs and the country's scientific institutions, VUZ's, and big libraries.

Information For Higher School Social Scientists

The "information explosion" placed VUZ teachers in a particularly difficult situation. In order to insure the successful Marxist-Leninist training of the students and contribute to their ideological instruction, the social science teachers must have reliable and timely information on the latest scientific achievements covering a broad range of problems related to training courses. Under the conditions of the ever-growing ideological struggle the VUZ personnel face, more than ever, the topical task set by Lenin in his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism:" "We must attentively follow all respective publications in all languages..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 45, p 25). From the journals of abstracts and problem abstract collections they gain the necessary information on new Marxist research covering a broad range of social sciences, whose data and facts they can use in the characterization of contemporary social processes and the exposure of anticommunist and opportunistic concepts.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Work Done by the Moscow Higher Technical School Imeni N. E. Bauman and the Saratov State University Imeni N. G. Chernyshevskiy for Upgrading the Ideological and Theoretical Level of the Teaching of Social Sciences" set the ministries of higher and secondary specialized education in the USSR and the RSFSR the task of providing, together with the USSR Academy of Sciences, information materials produced by the USSR Academy of Sciences INION to the socioeconomic departments of VUZ's. In this connection our institute undertook to prepare a series of abstract collections particularly directed to teachers in higher schools with a view to acquainting them with the achievements of Marxist thought and the condition of research along the basic directions of the social sciences domestically and abroad. In 1976 the VUZ's received over 30 such collections. This year the number of such information materials sent to the VUZ's will double.

Close creative relations between information producers and consumers are needed to insure the steady development of information work and the upgrading of its quality and scientific-theoretical and ideological effectiveness. The readers' conferences held in 1975-1976 in Moscow, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Alma-Ata, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Yerevan, Tbilisi, Tashkent, Frunze, and other cities were unquestionably useful to each of the parties and made possible the making of a number of useful corrections to the institute's activities.

The fact that the editors of all 16 series of journals of abstracts include 47 professors at higher educational institutions in Moscow, Leningrad, Gor'kiy, Tbilisi, and some other cities contributes to the great satisfaction of the interests of VUZ social scientists. It is pleasing that 720 professors and teachers are participating in INION preparations of information data as supernumerary abstractors.

Having considered the question of supplying social science teachers in VUZ with information data, the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education noted that the collections of abstracts and other information materials prepared by INION helped to upgrade the theoretical standard of the training process. A similar assessment was given by the all-union conference of heads of chairs of social sciences at higher educational institutions in the country (September 1976).

However, by far not all departments receive the journals of abstracts issued by INION. Many VUZ have limited themselves merely to subscribing to journals of abstracts for scientific libraries. Some pedagogical and agricultural institutes have failed to do even this. As a result, teachers who must bring theoretical knowledge to the masses of young specialists undergoing training are artificially deprived of information sources. Yet, this is inadmissible for social scientists.

It seems to us that in addition to its specialized journal of abstracts, each department must receive others such as "Problems of Scientific Communism," "Philosophical Sciences," "Economics," and "Study of Science."

We know that the writing of any new lecture or any scientific research work (paper, article, monograph, school aid) begins with the selection of bibliography. Here the teacher-social scientist is helped by numerous INION bibliographic publications. However, the subscription by VUZ's to such useful publications is so insignificant that they are simply unknown to many teachers. This leads to great time losses in the selection of necessary sources. In our view each department should have bibliographic along with abstract INION publications. The social sciences teaching department of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the rectors of VUZ should pay attention to this in taking subscriptions.

The contacts between the collective of INION and the faculties of higher educational institutions will unquestionably develop further. However, this development must be reciprocal. It is only with active interaction between producers and consumers of information that truly high results could be achieved. The institute must be made aware of the type of materials needed by the faculty for the renovation and enrichment of their lectures, and the topics in which the students are more interested. INION's abstracts publications will publish a greater number of abstracts of works by the social science departments. However, this will require the assistance of the faculty. A decision to this effect has been made by the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education. However, it is being poorly implemented.

Finally, it would be expedient to improve information work in the higher schools themselves. The VUZ information subdivisions should set up special sectors or groups of scientific information workers dealing with the social sciences.

Technical Support of Information Processes

Under contemporary conditions the improvement of existing and the development of new forms of information services become impossible without the extensive use of computers, and modern reproduction and microfilming facilities. Presently a great deal of domestic and foreign experience exists in the use of modern technical facilities by information organs and big libraries.

On this basis, last year the creation of an integrated automated system was initiated by the USSR Academy of Sciences INION. The institute set up a computer center with the latest equipment. In the future, after meaningful processing, all information will be fed to the computer and will be repeatedly used in the solution of various information problems.

INION publications will be prepared with the help of computers, photo-setters, selective distribution of information, retrospective retrieval of data from the computer's memory, and the establishment of a number of specialized data banks which could be used with the help of video terminals.

INION has undertaken the solution of these problems together with a number of institutes from the social sciences section of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium (Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, Central Economics-Mathematical Institute, the United States and Canada Institute, and others). Joining the efforts of a number of scientific collectives makes it possible not only to resolve more rapidly arising complex problems but to insure a uniform approach to the developed system.

The problems of automation and mechanization of information processes at INION and other institutes of the social sciences section of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium and the republic information centers, and the creation of a basic "data bank" at the institute covering the social sciences are very topical but involve the solution of many theoretical and practical problems. These problems will be considered in the next few months at a special all-union conference on problems of automation of information work in the field of the country's social sciences.

Naturally, this problem cannot be resolved without the increased aid provided by the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Science and Technology. We must take into consideration that institutes dealing with the humanities and with technology have different possibilities for mastering and utilizing electronic equipment. That is precisely why the information centers for social sciences require the additional attention of the respective governmental organs.

Information and International Cooperation

The successful development of information related to the social sciences calls for the establishment of international scientific relations with foreign scientific information centers and, above all, with the centers of the socialist countries.

At the present time cooperation on problems of scientific information in the field of the social sciences is fruitfully developing with respective institutions in Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Protocols and work plans for cooperation have been concluded with them within the framework of the interacademic agreements concluded among the socialist countries, stipulating the principles, basic directions, and forms of joint work, indicating specific scientific problems and topics, and earmarking measures aimed at the development of socialist cooperation and division of labor. Broad exchange of experience and information materials is taking place. The joint preparation of problem-topic collections of abstracts on topical ideological problems has been undertaken. All scientific information centers are preparing abstracts on the most interesting works related to the social sciences in their countries for their publication in the journal of abstracts OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI ZA RUBEZHOM.

The common objectives and tasks of the social sciences in the socialist countries call for more extensive cooperation and division of labor and efficient coordination of scientific information activities on a multilateral basis. Such cooperation could result in considerable saving of forces, funds, and time in processing the worldwide flow of publications and in the publication of abstracts journals, problem-topic collections, and bibliographic information. The conference of representatives of academies of sciences of socialist countries held in Berlin in November 1975 deemed it necessary to include in the program for multilateral scientific cooperation among academies of sciences information activities related to social sciences. In accordance with this decision, last summer representatives of seven academies of sciences signed in Moscow an agreement on the creation of an international information system for the social sciences (MISON).

The system covers above all the social sciences of great importance to the socioeconomic, political, ideological, and cultural development of the socialist countries.

Its main purposes are the following: to upgrade the effectiveness of scientific information on the social sciences; to eliminate unjustified duplication of the collection and processing of scientific data on the basis of the international division of labor; to insure possibilities for a conversion to a single processing of most prime sources and to multiple use of information; and to organize the joint publication of information materials.

The international information system for the social sciences is based on the cooperation developed among the national centers for scientific information, cooperation among the national systems, and the utilization, in the initial stage, of already applied methods, organizational forms, and technical facilities. In the future it will function as an automated system making extensive use of computers and other contemporary technical facilities. This is the final objective of the system.

MISON's activities plan calls for the regular publication of jointly prepared information materials (abstracts and bibliographic). The first MISON abstracts collection, dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, will be published in September 1977.

Relations with information centers of the capitalist countries are developing as well. Thus, last year a protocol was signed on the development of contacts with the French Center of Information on the Social Sciences. Agreements have been reached on the regular exchange of information publications and editions with the Information Center of Columbia University in New York, with York University in Canada, and others.

In June 1977 the USSR Academy of Sciences INION held in Moscow a conference of European centers of information and documentation in the field of the social sciences. It was attended by delegates from 20 European countries, Canada, and 6 international organizations representing the biggest information centers in the fields of the social and humanitarian sciences.

Such a representative conference on problems of information in the field of the social sciences is the first of its kind in Europe. The recommendations it approved emphasized that broadening contacts in the field of scientific information on the social sciences in Europe will be one of the effective means for the implementation of the principles of the Final Act of the European conference in Helsinki. The recommendations call for the following: expanding the international exchange of books, and of abstract and bibliographic publications and microfilms; cooperation in the preparation of international bibliographies on the social sciences; elaboration of proposals for the international standardization of information; exchange of method materials and technical information; insuring closer cooperation among information centers and libraries; cooperation in the creation of international information systems and technologies; organization of training courses for specialists in the field of new equipment on an international basis, and so on. The delegates to the conference expressed the wish that the European Center for the Coordination of Research and Documentation in the Field of the Social Sciences (Vienna center) undertake the implementation of such recommendations. It appealed to UNESCO with the request to give comprehensive support to the Vienna center in this respect.

In their addresses the Soviet participants in the conference emphasized that cooperation in the field of information must serve the ideals of scientific and social progress and exclude the dissemination of publications having nothing in common with such noble objectives.

The communist and workers parties of the socialist countries face the social sciences with important tasks. Improving scientific information and developing multilateral cooperation in this field are necessary prerequisites for upgrading further the level of scientific research and teaching of social sciences, upgrading the effectiveness of ideological work, and waging a struggle against bourgeois ideology, reformism, and revisionism.

RIGHT TO CREATIVITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 86-97

[Article by Yu. Melent'yev, RSFSR minister of culture]

[Text] The profound and comprehensive changes in the spiritual culture of developed socialism are an objective historical process closely related to the implementation of a number of economic, political, and ideological tasks. At the present stage of the building of communism even greater possibilities arise for the further growth of socialist culture. New laws created by life itself and by the spiritual needs of the people develop.

This has been expressed in the draft of the new USSR Constitution in which, for the first time in the history of mankind, the fundamental law of the state includes not only the guaranteed right of the working people to benefit from artistic and scientific values already created but the right to engage in creative activities as well.

The new socialist culture created after the victory of the October Revolution, imbuing everything that was best and progressive created by previous generations, developed into a truly nationwide culture created by the people and dedicating all its achievements to the people.

At the very dawn of the Soviet system V. I. Lenin scientifically substantiated and comprehensively described the nature of the concept of "cultural revolution." The great proletarian leader considered it an inseparable part of the socialist changes in the country. He proved clearly and visibly the dialectical process of the establishment of socialist culture and the place and importance of continuity in its development based on the critical reworking and mastering of the cultural heritage of previous epochs. He considered as the main element of the cultural revolution the constructive activities of the people's masses. "A powerful upsurge toward light and knowledge is coming from 'below,' i.e., from the mass of the working people removed by capitalism from education openly, through violence, hypocrisy, or deception," Lenin wrote ("Poln. Sobr. Soch," [Complete Collected Works], Vol 42, p 326). This upsurge toward culture by millions of people is the most characteristic feature of our revolution.

V. I. Lenin noted another aspect of the process of cultural development: "We have the right to be proud of the fact that we are contributing to this upsurge and are serving it" (Ibid.). He put together the two main forces of cultural construction--the upsurge and initiative of the people's masses themselves, and the party and state leadership which must serve this upsurge and assist it.

Decades have passed since and today we justifiably note the steadily growing role of socialist culture in the life of the Soviet people. In the past few years the CPSU Central Committee elaborated and adopted long-term programs for the most important directions in cultural construction. They include most important documents such as the decrees "On Literary-Artistic Criticism," "On Upgrading the Role of Libraries in the Communist Education of the Working People and Scientific and Technical Progress," and "On Work With the Creative Youth." "The great cause of building communism cannot be moved ahead without the all-round development of man himself," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 24th party congress. "Communism is as impossible without high level of culture, education, social consciousness, and inner maturity of the people as it is impossible without a corresponding material and technical base."

Five years later, at the 25th CPSU Congress, he said: "We have accomplished a great deal in improving the material prosperity of the Soviet people. We shall continue to resolve this problem systematically. However, the growth of material possibilities must be always paralleled by a rise in the ideological-moral and cultural standards of the people."

These views prove that the 9th and 10th five-year plans are a single entity in terms of economic strategy and cultural construction. They also emphasize not only the dependence of the cultural standard on the standard of socioeconomic life but the increased influence of culture itself on social life. Today, at the stage of the developed socialist society, and under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the organic combination of its achievements with the advantages of socialism, culture has considerably broadened its social functions. It has become an even more significant spiritual accelerator of social and scientific and technical progress. That is why the tremendously important document approved at the May 1977 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and submitted to nationwide discussion notes that "The state is concerned with the preservation and multiplication of the spiritual values of society and their extensive use for upgrading the cultural standard of the Soviet people. The development of professional art and people's artistic creativity are comprehensively encouraged in the USSR." This stipulation in the draft of the new USSR Constitution is a vivid confirmation of the tremendous role which culture plays in Soviet social life.

The culture of the developed socialist society includes not only already created artistic and scientific values but creative activities involved in their creation and the entire system for reinforcing the intellectual potential insured by the growth of education and enabling us to involve the

broad popular masses in direct participation in cultural construction. The characteristic features of socialist culture are its class, national, party, and international features, and true mass dissemination, conceived not only in terms of the increased number of consumers of spiritual goods but as the ever-growing number of active creators of culture among the people.

"Socialism not only opened to the toiling masses broad access to spiritual values," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "but turned them into direct makers of culture. One of the vivid confirmations of this is the unusual scope of people's artistic creativity." This process is based on the very nature of the socialist social system and on the party's and the government's policy aimed at the ever fuller satisfaction of the growing material and spiritual needs of the Soviet people. Like professional art, the creativity of the people is an active participant in the shaping of the communist spiritual culture. It is a source of happiness and inspiration to millions of people and a means for their ideological enrichment and moral education. It expresses their will, feelings, and thoughts.

Born as a mass nonprofessional democratic social movement, and rallying within its ranks people of different professions, nationalities, educational levels, age groups, social positions, and cultural levels, from the very first days following the victory of the October Revolution amateur art met with maximal support. It became a party, a governmental matter. Lenin had deep faith in the creative forces of the people and did not conceive of their development without energetic constructive activities, including art work.

In fact, the energy of the people who achieved radical revolutionary changes tried to prove itself not only in the economic and social fields but in various forms of artistic creativity as well. In the very first years of the Soviet system A. V. Lunacharskiy noted the "tremendous and instinctive thrust of the masses toward art and, particularly, toward the theater. Worker and peasant theater circles blossomed throughout Russia in the thousands if not tens of thousands. Thousands of young people attended all kinds of studios and courses whose number was incredible" (A. V. Lunacharskiy, "O Teatre i Dramaturgii" [On the Theater and Play Writing]. In two volumes. Volume 1, Moscow, 1958, p 141).

Decades later the creative energy of the masses developed into a great variety of forms of amateur folk art.

Our country has over 800,000 amateur art circles and collectives. They include about 15 million adults and 10 million students. Over 600 million people annually attend amateur art concerts in culture clubs and palaces. Every day tens of millions of radio listeners and television viewers become acquainted with folk artists thanks to the radio and television. An all-union exhibition of works by amateur painters and masters of decorative-applied art, opened on the eve of the 16th congress of USSR trade unions at the Central Exhibits Hall in Moscow displaying about 8,000 works by 3,100 amateur painters. These were selections from many tens of thousands of

works exhibited in all union republics within the framework of the first all-union festival of amateur artistic creativity by the working people. In the Russian Federation alone, in addition to many thousands of amateur art circles, tremendous work is being done to provide cultural services to the population by over 1,000 music and drama people's theaters, theaters for young audiences, puppet theaters, small theaters, and almost 1,500 amateur music collectives, circuses, and motion picture studios, including over 300 song and dance ensembles, over 500 academic and folk choirs, over 100 people's and ballroom dancing ensembles, and about 300 symphony, variety, and folk instruments orchestras.

Scientific and technical progress is introducing its features in the artistic creativity of the people. Today art design, amateur motion pictures and mass photography are fully represented in the amateur arts. In many places individual creativity has been converted into motion picture and camera associations and amateur studios creating serious feature and documentary films some of which could challenge professional motion pictures. Some amateur photographic exhibits could amaze even professional photography experts with their sincerity, aesthetic feeling, and high artistic taste.

Many such examples could be cited. However, one could hardly measure in terms of figures and percentages the great contribution which amateur art is making in our joint work for the ideological, moral, and aesthetic education of the working people, in the struggle for the ideals of communism and against the nefarious influence of bourgeois ideology and morality, and against petit bourgeois mentality.

The growth of amateur art among the working people has assumed a truly mass nature in our country. At the same time the qualitative level of folk art is rising. This is largely explained by the fact that our theaters are sponsoring to an ever-greater extent plants, kolkhozes, and construction projects such as the Baykal-Amur main line, and the Kama automotive vehicles plant, as was pointed out at the 25th CPSU Congress, and the fact that amateur collectives and folk theaters are headed by experienced masters. Their entry into amateur art has not been spontaneous. It was the product of a planned and prepared process.

At the present time the Russian Federation has some 4,000 music and art schools. Art schools have been opened in 31 oblasts in the republic; 29 higher and 246 secondary schools are training workers in culture and the arts.

This creates conditions which, on the one hand, enable us successfully to train professional art specialists and, on the other, to train heads of circles, studios, orchestras, and folk theaters whose high skills are a reliable base for a qualitatively new display and manifestation of the people's talents.

Unquestionably, the artistic creativity of the people's masses, representing a variety of the aesthetic mastery of reality, is influencing to an ever-greater extent professional art as well which is not only reinforcing its ranks with the best representatives of the talent of the people but, in general, generously draws from this very rich source. It takes from it directness, optimism, national coloring, and a purposeful perception of the world and, sometimes, artistic ideas and solutions.

The implementation of the great program earmarked at the 25th CPSU Congress will require purposeful efforts and a profound approach to the processes of cultural construction, a thorough constant study of positive changes in the spiritual needs of the people, and the study of the effectiveness of our work in the field of culture.

A specific system of state and social guidance of clubs and amateur art has developed in the country. It includes the daily work of institutions of union and republic ministries of cultures and their local organs, trade unions, and Komsomol organizations. Each union republic has its central house for people's creativity and central scientific-methodical office for cultural and educational work. Each autonomous republic, kray, and oblast has its house of people's creativity, scientific-method offices, and trade union amateur art houses. They shape up the repertory, upgrade the skills of heads of amateur collectives, promote folk creativity through the press, radio, and television, organize the sponsorship of professional artists, promote festivals, reviews, competitions, and exhibits, sum up the experience of best collectives, and study the condition of one or another type of amateur art. All this work largely contributes to the development of the artistic creativity of the masses.

We could confidently say that this system of guiding the creativity of the people is justified as a whole. However, bearing in mind the increased effectiveness and quality of organizational-creative work, it requires improvements. One of the means for such improvements is the further strengthening of the people's creativity houses, many of which suffer from a weak material base and have insufficiently skilled cadres.

Of late, with a view to improving the management system of the clubs and amateur art the Russian Federation is experimenting with the establishment of integrated scientific-methodical centers for people's creativity and club work on the basis of the existing people's creativity houses and method offices. These centers will have full-time chief and senior specialists for all types and genres of amateur art and personnel in charge of the basic activities of club institutions.

The experience of the Russian Federation also indicates that further improvements in overall club work are possible through centralization, departmental as well as interdepartmental. The press has already covered the fruitful results of studies which have been conducted over a number of years in this connection in Sverdlovskaya, Leningrad, and other oblasts. The hope is that this experiment will be continued successfully and applied more daringly.

One of the necessary prerequisites for a mass cultural movement--this real "art of the millions"-- is the effective organization of the leisure time of the working people. The amount of leisure time of the Soviet people is increasing steadily as a result of the directed efforts of the socialist society in which leisure time is considered a social gain.

According to the Institute of Sociological Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences (work headed by V. D. Patrushev) the Soviet working people have more leisure time than the workers in most highly developed capitalist countries. However, the extensive increase of leisure time is not the only indicator of its value. The most important factor is the intensiveness of its use and its socially significant content.

A study of the leisure time structure made by the institute shows that its content is far richer among the working people in the USSR and the other socialist countries compared with the capitalist countries. The Soviet people use a considerable percentage of their leisure time to upgrade their cultural standards. Thus, whereas in 1972 working people in the USSR (men) spent 4.6 hours per week in education and self-education, the respective figures were 1.3 hours in France and 0.8 hours in the United States. Furthermore, of late the time spent by the Soviet working people in training, upgrading their skills, and increasing their spiritual enrichment has been rising steadily.

Practical experience shows that one of the most effective means for the utilization of the leisure time for the aesthetic and sociopolitical education of the individual is his direct participation in the creation of spiritual values and in artistic creativity. The establishment of favorable conditions for this in the formulation of long-term plans for the social development of rayons, enterprises, and cities should be especially considered.

It is no secret that more or less prestigious types of labor activities and professions with a more or less attractive type of work exist and will remain. Labor processes which cannot fully satisfy the natural aspiration of man toward creative work will not disappear either today or when the socialist society reaches a higher level of development. Therefore, it is entirely likely that a certain segment of the working people will be able to satisfy such an aspiration in their leisure time.

The people's universities, whose role in the organization of moral education through graphic arts and in the dissemination of a Marxist-Leninist outlook will be increasing further and further, are greatly contributing to spiritual enrichment. The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress emphasized the need to develop the people's universities and to improve their activities. The creation of conditions for the self-education of the working people is also guaranteed in the draft of the new USSR Constitution. The people's university will become an important link in the system of uninterrupted education of the Soviet person.

Leisure time is the basis for the training system offered by the people's university. It is precisely this that makes it possible to combine a purely training process with the mastering of creative artistic professions, and practical habits and skills useful in daily life. In other words, the main feature of the activities of the people's university is the principle of the highly intellectual, moral, and artistically organized recreation.

In our country leisure time has become a powerful incentive for the blossoming of the individual and his capabilities and talents, for broadening the outlook, range of interests, needs, and inclinations, and for the development of various forms of creative activity.

Rayon, oblast, republic, and all-union reviews of amateur collectives and of art creativity by the working people have long become a typical feature of our reality. They vividly prove the spiritual wealth and high cultural standard of the Soviet people and their various artistic gifts. Performances by many collectives are interesting because of their broad repertory and the deep fulness of content and highly professional performances.

The creative people's talents contribute to upgrading the cultural standard of the working people, to improving their art education, and to advancing the system of cultural services to the population. For example, the following data characterize the scope of rural amateur art activities in the Russian Federation: about 3 million rural amateur artists participated in the 1972-1973 all-Russian review; compared with the period which preceded the review the number of amateur art collectives rose considerably and the number of their participants in state clubs alone rose by nearly 200,000 people. This is one of the most convincing proofs that the tremendous and steadily growing scope of the people's artistic creativity is an objective law in the development of society under socialist conditions.

This law was manifested most vividly during the first all-union festival of amateur art, now drawing to an end, which rallies the efforts of state, trade union, and Komsomol organs and organizations and calls for extensive organic interaction among amateur collectives and members of the creative intelligentsia, the club aktivs and professional club workers, as well as rural and urban amateur art collectives.

Let us emphasize that this is a first review of achievements in amateur art on such a scope made possible by the all-union festival. Our country has acquired extensive experience in sponsoring reviews, competitions, and festivals on an impressive scale, always distinguished by their mass nature and their mastery. The present festival, however, unrolled a panoramic view of amateur art throughout the country, unparalleled in terms of scope and variety, and expanded its scales immeasurably. In the Russian Federation alone over 7.5 million people participated in the festival. In the course of the festival new art collectives appeared everywhere and new talent was added to existing circles. Thus, over 400 collectives were established in Kemerovskaya Oblast, rallying about 30,000 participants. In the republic as a whole the number of participants in amateur art activities rose by over 500,000 people.

The first all-union festival of amateur art was a great folk art celebration. This was largely helped by the time of the festival which was also the 30th anniversary of the great victory over fascism, the 70th anniversary of the first Russian revolution, the 25th CPSU Congress, and the 60th anniversary of the Soviet state...Each of these landmarks is not only a reflection of the great history of our homeland but affects the biographies of towns, settlements, and villages where the participants and audiences of festival concerts and exhibits were born and live, the enterprises where they work, and the destinies of all Soviet people. In terms of the influence of art there is no more powerful force than the direct and general involvement of both creators and audiences with history which life itself converts into material for the stage!

The ideological feature of this great review of popular talent, which gave it unparalleled sociopolitical significance, was manifested particularly vividly during the final concert given by the laureates of the first all-union festival of amateur art of the working people in the RSFSR, dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, given on the main stage of the country--at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses--in the presence of the leaders of the party and the government, headed by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

About 3,000 amateur artists--mechanizers and metallurgical workers, physicians and agronomers, cattle breeders and geologists, construction workers, teachers, and heads of enterprises--unrolled for the public an endless panoramic view of the vivifying art of the nations and nationalities inhabiting the Russian Federation. Performances striking in terms of the power of the talent displayed alternated as a miraculous kaleidoscope. A. Lenskiy, RSFSR honored culture worker, and chief of the blast furnace shop at the Zapadno-Sibirskiy metallurgical plant, performed with amazing depth the "Song of the Burning Metal" by V. Shainskiy. S. Oorzhak Khunaashtar-Ool, shepherd at the sheep-breeding Aldan Maadyr Sovkhoz, Tuvinskaya ASSR, the only performer in the world who is a master of 10 vocal singing styles, and an unparalleled folk singer, charmed the audience. The poems of V. Mikhalev, a poet shepherd and member of the USSR Writers Union, were filled with bright and touching love for his native country. The Samotlor agitation brigade from Tyumenskaya Oblast, described the exploits of the pioneers extracting oil in the difficult conditions of Western Siberia and their attitude toward the most democratic constitution in the world. The Serebryanoye Zveno patriotic songs ensemble from Tynda, Amurskaya Oblast, sang the glory of the young builders of the main line of the centry. The deeply touching song "Small Earth" by A. Pakhmutova was performed by S. Miloserdov, worker at the Stroyplastmass Association (Mytishchi) and V. Chekhutskiy, worker at the culture house of the Za Mir i Trud Kolkhoz, Krasnodarskiy Kray. The final festival concert in which tens of collectives and soloists from all autonomous republics, oblasts, and national okrugs participated, became a true creative report on multinational art in Soviet Russia.

The all-union festival of amateur art performances by the people's masses clearly proved the unquestionable fact that an inviolable right among the gains of the socialist society and among the rights granted to its citizens, as stipulated in the draft of the new USSR Constitution, is the right to creativity, to the expression and manifestation of the artistic talents of the working people, and the direct creation of cultural values, which is an absolute prerequisite for the steady growth of the spiritual potential of socialism.

The development and improvement of the people's artistic creativity are contributing to the solution of the most important problem stipulated in the CPSU program--the gradual raising of the rural cultural level to the urban level.

Many difficulties remain along this way, including the relatively low density of the rural network of cultural institutions, and the seasonally cyclical nature of labor processes which determine the characteristic rhythm of rural life. However, thanks to the constant concern displayed by the party and the state, the material base of agricultural production and rural culture is being reorganized at an ever-growing pace. The Communist Party has earmarked and is implementing a comprehensive program for the socioeconomic and cultural reorganization of the villages in the Nonchernozem area of unparalleled scale and nature. In the 10th Five-Year Plan new comfortable culture houses will be built here. The network of people's theaters and amateur music collectives, motor vehicle clubs, children's libraries, and music and art schools will be expanded considerably. The appearance of agroindustrial complexes and agro-cities, and the migration processes themselves are "eroding" the age-old line separating the village from the city. However, the elimination of the major disparities between town and country does not mean in the least the automatic implantation of urban culture in the countryside. It is a question of something else--of reciprocal enrichment and of protecting the age-old treasury of folk art.

Safeguarding the best features of original creativity, and tactfully and respectfully converting folklore, songs, and other treasures of the people to contemporary professional art is a delicate and responsible matter. We need the combination of highly professional art with multinational folk creativity in order to insure the further dynamic development and secure the continuity, integrity, strength, and international power of Soviet socialist culture.

The artistic crafts, the people's handicrafts, are the most valuable property of our culture.

In a century of headlong scientific and technical progress the question of the artistic creativity of the people and of the development of handicrafts based on creative manual work becomes particularly important. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the People's Artistic Crafts," imbued with

concern for the development of the culture of the communist society, draws the attention of the party and artistic public to the further development of folk creativity. It reminds us that the condition and development of folk art is an important and socially significant factor of our entire spiritual life.

It is well known that folk art is an inexhaustible source which feeds all culture and contributes to its national originality. Folk art, whose traditions have developed over many centuries, and which was an example of wisdom and of the value and beauty of creative work, is a special, and extraordinarily bright page of our history and multinational culture. Combining original and functional aspects with high artistic qualities, folk art participates in the development of contemporary culture. Its influence on the future of the graphic and decorative-applied art is quite tangible. In recent years its role has been particularly enhanced as an aesthetic factor as well, molding the spiritual aspect of the Soviet man. The ever-rising amount of standardization in architecture and life, and in interior decoration has created, along with the increased prosperity of the working people, particular demand for unique "handmade" works by folk craftsmen.

At the present time the range of people engaged in artistic creativity in their leisure time has become substantially broader. They include kolkhoz members, workers, and members of the intelligentsia. Their creative work is developing quite intensively and, sometimes, is based on traditional applied art. Essentially, however, it represents a new and rather prestigious variety of amateur art. Many such artists work together with the folk creativity houses and systematically participate in exhibits.

Contemporary folk graphic art is a complex and comprehensive phenomenon. It actively participates in molding the material environment and is an important element of the cultural life of society. That is why no single oblast, kray, zonal, republic, or all-union art exhibit fails to include folk art works. Folk crafts were represented in a separate area at the Sovetskaya Rossiya fifth republic art exhibition. The exhibition, located in the premises of the USSR Academy of Art (which, in itself, is quite noteworthy) was tremendously successful. The art of the folk masters of our country is well known in many foreign countries. Every year the artistic crafts of the Russian Federation are displayed in over 20 exhibits and fairs in various parts of the world.

As many major arts, our country's folk decorative art develops a taste for beauty and contributes to the molding of a harmoniously developed individual. That is why the Communist Party and Soviet government display constant concern for the production of art goods, for collectives of folk master craftsmen, and for original talents.

The development of spiritual culture is an exceptionally complex process which has its specific difficulties and unresolved problems. "A cultural problem cannot be resolved as rapidly as a political or a military problem," Lenin said. "...Politically one could achieve victory in a few weeks in a period of aggravated crisis. In war one could achieve victory in a few months. No cultural victory is possible within such a time. The very nature of the project requires a longer period of time and a longer time for adaptation, planning the work, and showing the greatest persistence, stubbornness, and systematic efforts" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," Vol 44, pp 174-175).

Determining the level and nature of culture and art establishments, we must take into consideration the qualitative changes occurring in the spiritual aspect of the modern man and in the spiritual life of all social strata. The most important gain of the cultural revolution is the scientific, the dialectical-materialistic and Marxist-Leninist outlook which is the ideological and theoretical foundation of the socialist social consciousness and the common property of all classes and social groups. However, the ideological level already reached does not mean in the least that it is possible to weaken ideological or political education. As was reemphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress, bourgeois ideology is not surrendering its positions. On the contrary, the ideological struggle is intensifying. Today our ideological enemy is particularly concentrating on the youth, trying to distort the nature and results of socialist cultural policy, and promote feelings of nihilism and a skeptical attitude toward the gains of socialism. That is why ideological-political education retains its leading role and significance in the activities of culture and art institutions.

In recent years the concept of "mass culture" has become widespread in the West. This is, so to speak, a culture substitute, consisting of low-grade spiritual works which, in the opinion of their creators and promoters, should feed the mass which is allegedly incapable of understanding, appreciating, and mastering the works of real culture, addressed only to the "refined connoisseurs," or a selected elite. As a rule, this elite turns out to consist of the powerful rich, while the gray mass consists of workers and peasants oppressed by their daily concern for their survival. The ideological nature of "mass culture" reflects the spiritual crises of the bourgeois world and its inability to resolve the problems raised with the development of civilization. Its social objective is to draw the people's masses away from the main problems of our time and from serious thoughts about events in our reality and replace the struggle for real social progress with a world of base passions and thoughtless entertainment.

We value and love the works of the progressive cultural workers in the West--the representatives of great literature and great art. However, we also know that the path of the true values of culture to the broad popular strata in the capitalist world is not simple. People dedicated to business do everything possible to scatter thorns along this path. The flood of low-grade

output produced by them for commercial purposes is so big that it is literally drowning true works of literature and art. The novels of Ernest Hemmingway, the films of Federico Fellini, the paintings of Rockwell Kent and Renato Guttuso, and the works of many other real artists are blocked by barricades consisting of primitive mystery novels, openly pornographic magazines, horror movies, and westerns. Bearing in mind that the producers of such mass spiritual waste own all advertising facilities, printing presses, exhibition halls, and motion picture studios, the difficulty of those who create real cultural values in reaching the people becomes clear.

In the Soviet society the main purpose of the extensive dissemination of the achievements of culture and science is the creation of a harmoniously developed individual and the elimination of major disparities between physical and mental labor.

The noble objective which those who are defending with all their hearts the ideals of the Communist Party, which have become the ideals of the broad people's masses, have set themselves is to create conditions under which every person would have not only the right but the real possibility to rise to an understanding of the greatest spiritual values of the world, and have the ability to enjoy what is truly beautiful and reject what is hideous.

Our culture is a culture which encompasses the most valuable creations of the human genius. It organically combines artistic creativity with the struggle for communist ideals. In order for such a culture to become a vital need for the masses, the masses themselves must reach the heights of culture. That is why books, films, records, art reproductions, plays, and radio and television transmissions cannot be business objects in our country. Their purpose is different: they are a means for the education of the masses in the highest and most beautiful meaning of the word. They bring knowledge, shape tastes, contribute to the more profound understanding of social phenomena and processes, and develop an exacting attitude toward the real works of literature and art--the treasure of human civilization.

"Mass culture" and culture for the masses are entirely different concepts.

In our Soviet understanding culture for the masses is also the highest culture which includes Homer and Shakespeare, Leonardo da Vinci, Lomonosov, Beethoven, Glinka, Balzac and Dickens, Pushkin and Shevchenko, Tolstoy and Dostoyevskiy, Repin and Rhodin, Rolland and Tagore, Gor'kiy and Sholokhov, Prokof'yev, and Shostakovich. The works of these and hundreds of other great artists have become an inseparable part of the spiritual world of millions of Soviet people. This spiritual world, the loftiest criteria, and the Marxist-Leninist outlook are precisely the soil on which grows the artistic creativity of the people's masses in the socialist world.

Culture for the masses, our socialist culture, is also the culture of the broadest possible people's masses. It is a continuing and steadily deepening process of the creation of new spiritual riches and of the discovery and

self-assertion of the spiritual potential of man. That is why not only the exposure of the masses to socialist culture but the broadening of the realm of their participation in its creation and the increased number of its creators are so important. "The artistic creativity of the people," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "is one of the characteristic features of our Soviet reality, of our life."

Having become a necessary part of Soviet culture and acquiring an unparalleled scope, the artistic creativity of the working people in the Soviet Union is becoming to an ever-greater extent an international factor. This is confirmed by the fact that along with the worldwide influence exerted by our art and culture the international prestige of our amateur art is rising. Evermore frequently folk collectives are entrusted with a most responsible mission: that of representing Soviet art abroad. They bring the truth about socialism and about our people. They express the noble communist ideals. With their brilliant performances in the capitalist countries our amateur artists are making their greatest contribution to the struggle for peace and mutual understanding among peoples.

Recently the people of Britain and Ireland applauded the artistic performances of the Rossiya song and dance ensemble of the Lyubertsy palace of culture in Moscow Oblast; the people of Cyprus enjoyed the truly folk art of the Iskorka ensemble of the Iskra Kolkhoz, Kotel'nichskiy Rayon, Kirovskaya Oblast; in Italy the Lenok ensemble for Russian folk songs and dances from Torzhka, Kalininskaya Oblast, was awarded the main prize in Italy; the perky outpourings of the Livenskiye Garmoshki, from Orlovskaya Oblast, were heard in the concert halls of West Berlin; the performances of the Zharki Khakas ensemble, and the song and dance ensemble of the Osinskay Rayon house of culture, Permskaya Oblast, were welcomed in Belgium with tremendous interest; the honored Art dance ensemble of the Severo-Osetinskaya ASSR won over the public in France with its outstanding program; thousands of people in Portugal welcomed enthusiastically the youth ensemble of metallurgical workers from the Orenburg area.

"Art belongs to the people," said Lenin in his talk with Klara Tsetkin. "It must sink its deepest roots in the very thick of the broad toiling masses. It must be understood by these masses and loved by them. It must combine the feelings, thoughts, and will of these masses and enhance them. It must awaken in them the artist and develop him" ("V. I. Lenin o Literature i Iskusstve" [V. I. Lenin on Literature and the Arts], Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1976, p 657).

This brilliant Leninist legacy which contains the most profound idea of the achievement of the natural attraction of the broad popular masses for artistic creativity under socialism, is legislatively codified now in a number of articles of the draft of the new constitution of our great homeland. The artistic creativity of the people's masses under the conditions of developed socialism is an inseparable part of Soviet socialist culture and one of the important factors in communist education and the creation of a communist civilization.

PERMANENT FACTOR OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 98-105

[Article by Yuriy Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet-French section of the USSR parliamentary group]

[Text] The world witnessed a major international event: the official visit which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, paid to France on 20-22 June. This visit, as was noted by our party's Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers, was an important contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and its program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation and for the freedom and independence of the peoples.

"We," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said, "highly value the importance of the talks held then with the President of the French Republic and members of the French government. Extensive and important work was accomplished through our joint efforts." In turn, emphasizing the importance of this fruitful visit, V. Giscard d'Estaing stated that the USSR and France, the first to open the path to detente in Europe, thus indicate that they remain loyal to the objectives they set themselves 10 years ago.

The 22 June Soviet-French declaration clearly states that "the friendship and cooperation between the USSR and France are and will remain an important and permanent component of their foreign policies." This document, the joint declaration on detente, the declaration on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the documents on cooperation in trade and industry and in the scientific and technical areas reminded the entire world yet once again, and convincingly, of the effectiveness of the principles of cooperation between the USSR and France drafted and signed at the highest level as a result of the first official visit which Comrade L. I. Brezhnev paid to France in October 1971.

It was precisely then that the two countries proclaimed that the policy of agreement and cooperation between the USSR and France will continue to be promoted; its purpose is to become a permanent policy in their relations

and a permanent factor in international life. Today, slightly less than six years later, we can note most clearly that this principle, like all the other stipulations in that document, has withstood the test of time and that its systematic and firm implementation is having a clearly beneficial impact on the international political climate of our planet.

Highly rating the accords and agreements reached in the course of the June talks designed to strengthen detente and international cooperation, and insuring the further constructive development of Soviet-French relations, the world's progressive public opinion unanimously notes that these results could be achieved thanks to the proper understanding of the national interests of both countries, combined with profound concern for the solution of basic international problems in the interests of all mankind.

These results are a new confirmation of the vitality and great power of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among countries belonging to opposite social systems. As the Bulgarian newspaper RABOTNICHESKO DELO justifiably wrote on this occasion, "the visit paid by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev was a vivid manifestation of the peaceful offensive launched by the Soviet Union six years ago with the famous Decree on Peace."

On the other hand, the success of the Soviet-French talks was insured by the fact that the principle of peaceful coexistence met with the necessary French understanding and support. This understanding and support, naturally, did not develop of themselves, but in the course of complex political processes -- in the course of an adamant struggle between supporters and proponents of a constructive development of relations between our countries within France itself, which is still not free of the negative influences of its allies in the North Atlantic Pact.

This makes the results of the visit to France even more important and valuable. Satisfaction with these results was expressed by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers, which fully approved the activities of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev.

In the Interests of Peace in Europe and Throughout the World

We remember that from the very first days of the building of the Soviet state, Vladimir Il'ich Lenin ascribed vitally important significance to insuring peace in Europe and throughout the world. He ascribed a particular role in our foreign policy to the development of relations with France, a great continental power. When the leader of the radical socialists, deputy and mayor of Lyons, Edouard Herriot, arrived in Moscow in September 1922 and stated that "the purpose of the visit is the political, moral, and economic rapprochement between France and Russia," and that "only the return of Russia to the family of European peoples can give Europe full peace," he was given a warm reception.

This initiative by a noted French political leader frightened the then opponents of the young Soviet state, and above all, the reactionary British

circles which cherished Churchill's dream of strangling communism in its cradle. In this connection, the correspondent of the British OBSERVER and MANCHESTER GUARDIAN asked Lenin the following: "The anti-Russian press is depicting Herriot's welcome in Moscow and the Franco-Russian talks as a decisive turning point in the foreign policy of Soviet Russia. Is this correct? Is it true that Russia...is ready to conclude an agreement with France directed against England?"

To this V. I. Lenin answered the following:

"Unquestionably, we ascribe great value to Herriot's reception in Moscow and a step toward rapprochement with France or talks with it, which have now become possible and likely, and, one would like to think, necessary. Any rapprochement with France is exceptionally desirable to us, particularly bearing in mind the fact that Russia's commercial interests adamantly demand a rapprochement with this strongest continental power. We are convinced, however, that this rapprochement does not in any way entail an obligation to make any change in our policy toward England. We consider that entirely friendly relations with both countries are fully possible and they are our objective" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 45, p 237).

Therefore, from the very beginning our party and Soviet state have been ready to promote the most extensive development of peaceful and business relations with all capitalist countries. Such relations developed even though the reactionary forces constantly opposed them. The influence of these forces was felt repeatedly in France as well. Nevertheless, at critical moments in history, common sense gained the upper hand in that country. This had a beneficial influence on the overall circumstances in Europe and beyond.

When Edouard Herriot became prime minister in 1924, he informed the Soviet government that it was recognized by France. That same day, 28 October, G. V. Chicherin, people's commissar for foreign affairs, stated at the session of the USSR Central Executive Committee, that "one cannot fail to see the significant role which France plays, particularly on the European continent, as a result of which the establishment of friendly relations between France and the USSR will have most important results for the entire international situation on the European continent and in other parts of the world."

Life itself confirmed how farsighted this statement was. Experiencing many trials, Soviet-French relations withstood the severe test of time, particularly in World War II, when shoulder to shoulder, the Soviet and French people fought the common enemy. It was entirely natural that after a certain period of time related to the continuing Cold War, President de Gaulle went to Moscow to lay the foundations for a new stage in the relations between our countries in the interests of strengthening the peace earned at such high cost.

Our common political objectives, de Gaulle said in the Kremlin on 30 June 1966, are detente, accord, and security.

The 1 July 1966 Soviet-French declaration issued as a result of this memorable visit laid the foundations for subsequent cooperation which not only contributed to the successful development of bilateral relations between the USSR and France, but was destined to become, as Georges Pompidou, de Gaulle's successor in the presidency, said, "the cornerstone of the European building."

The basic stipulations on the inviolability of present borders, noninterference in domestic affairs, equality, independence, and the abandonment of the use of force or the threat of its use were formulated for the first time in Article 7 of the Principles of Cooperation Between the USSR and France signed six years ago in Paris. These principles, as we know, were subsequently recognized by 35 countries which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and which were the core of its Final Act.

Soviet-French relations are continuing to develop strictly in accordance with these principles, giving the entire world an example of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

As L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in the course of the visit which Giscard d'Estaing paid to Moscow in October 1975, the main factor determining the significance of the Soviet-French rapprochement on a broad international level is that since the talks with General de Gaulle, "the Soviet Union and France, on the basis of their national interests and high responsibility for the fate of the world, made the basic problems of European and international security the cornerstone of their relations."

Concern with the strengthening of detente is a focal point of attention.

The present visit paid by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium went far beyond the framework of Soviet-French relations. Key problems in contemporary international life were discussed in the course of the talks: consolidation of the peace and detente, elimination of hotbeds of military danger, termination of the arms race, and prevention of the threat of a nuclear war.

This was thoroughly and extensively discussed during the talks by the French press of all political persuasions. "One of the first words spoken at the airport (on the arrival of the important Soviet guest) was 'detente'," recalled the newspaper QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS. "L. I. Brezhnev and V. Giscard d'Estaing begin with detente," read a headline in L'AUORE. "Detente and security are the main topic for the meeting in Rambouillet," noted L'HUMANITE.

The Soviet Union and France, said L. I. Brezhnev in his speech at the Elysee Palace on 21 June, "have an opportunity to express their joint weighty statement in favor of the consolidation and progress of the noble cause of

detente. Without question, their words will become an appeal to all other governments, states, and peoples without exception. It will be an important stimulating factor in international life." These words were said in the joint declaration on detente signed by the heads of the two countries. It proves convincingly the resolve of both countries to pursue the path laid out at the Helsinki Conference and to act in favor of peace, security, and equal cooperation. The force of their example will without question arouse a vast international response.

In this most important political document, the USSR and France proclaim that the superior interests of mankind most adamantly demand that countries and peoples abandon a policy based on mistrust, rivalry, and tension, and acknowledge that despite the differences in their outlooks and social systems they are united against dangers threatening them.

The USSR and France stated that nations must abandon the use of force and the threat of its use, and the stockpiling of weapons as a means of influencing the policy of other countries, resolving disputes by peaceful means and encouraging cooperation. They confirmed the importance of the specific implementation of the Final Act solemnly drafted in Helsinki, and of active support of efforts launched in this direction. They proclaimed their resolve to engage in further active efforts in favor of detente as their own policy, as well as through joint efforts and the development of relations with other countries.

Both in the course of the talks in Rambouillet and in his public speeches during his visit, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev repeatedly emphasized the need to combine military with political detente. "Even at the risk of being accused of a tendency toward repetition, I will say yet once again that there is no more urgent problem or more important task today than putting an end to the arms race and converting to real steps toward detente," he said on 21 June. "What is the worth of all the fine words and declarations on support for peace and of everything we have already been able to achieve in the fields of detente and peaceful coexistence among countries if one fine day, a spark develops in a sensitive sector and all the stockpiles of means of destruction capable of devastating the earth and killing entire nations explode?"

As reported by the press, the Soviets pointed out in Rambouillet that the question of limiting strategic armaments plays a most important role today. However, the impression is given that no progress has been made in the continuing talks on this problem between the USSR and the United States. The Soviet side also expressed its concern about the fact that some actions on the part of the Western countries are leading to an even greater confrontation between the two blocs in Europe, conflicting with the stipulations of the Final Act of the European Conference and inconsistent with the spirit of detente. France's membership in the North Atlantic bloc and its cooperation with a number of NATO organizations were mentioned in this connection.

Commenting on these views, the French press recalls that of late there has been a discussion in France concerning the militaristic concept of "front

line battles," and the possibility of using French nuclear weapons not only to defend the national territory, as contemplated by General de Gaulle, but in the interests of "neighbors and allies" as well is mentioned.

It is true that in his meeting with foreign journalists on 23 June, French Prime Minister Barre said, on the subject of this concept, that "we (i.e., France -- the author) will not deploy our nuclear forces on any foreign territory whatsoever." However, the French public is nevertheless expressing its legitimate concern on the subject of talks about the "battle on the front lines" ...a battle against whom, as L'HUMANITE asked the French leaders directly. It added the following: "In fact, it is a question of a strategy promoted over many years by NATO extremists and, in particular, by the Bundeswehr generals."

Under such circumstances, it becomes even more important to insure the factual and immediate progress toward the implementation of the important agreements and accords achieved in Fontainebleau on a broad range of problems related to the strengthening of international security, in the field of struggle for disarmament, above all, the more so since a certain rapprochement in the positions of the Soviet Union and France has taken place in this area.

The Soviet-French declaration clearly states that the USSR and France "intend, bearing in mind the noted role which both countries play in the international arena in favor of detente and security, to participate in a spirit of initiative in the efforts launched toward disarmament."

Guided by the desire to encourage any initiative which could contribute to universal and total disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, under strict and effective international control, as the declaration states, both countries have agreed to sponsor a special United Nations General Assembly meeting on such matters. They pledged to dedicate every effort to insure that such a discussion leads to positive and specific results, which would provide new impetus in the field of disarmament, with a view to saving the world from the dangers triggered by the nuclear and conventional arms race.

The USSR and France retain their full interest in the holding of a world disarmament conference and express the wish that in the immediate future the necessary conditions for such a conference be secured, in particular the participation of all nuclear powers.

The resolve to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons included in the declaration is very important. As we know, France is not one of the signatories of the nonproliferation treaty. However, in September 1975, the French minister of foreign affairs stated to the United Nations General Assembly that the French government intends to abide by the main treaties concluded in the field of nuclear weapons as though it had signed them. Now another significant step has been taken in this area: the Soviet-French declaration on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons contains such respective obligations.

Political commentators also properly assessed the declaration of the French side to the effect that "it is continuing to consider with interest the suggestion of the Soviets on banning the development and production of new types of mass destruction weapons and of new systems of such weapons." This suggestion becomes particularly important now that the United States and its NATO allies are engaged in a devil's sabbath -- literally every day the press reports that the production of ever-newer mass destruction weapons has been undertaken.

The Soviet public heartily welcomed the words of the French president to the effect that now we must "undertake firmly to deal with the disarmament problem," and will welcome the specific steps taken in French diplomacy in this direction.

Finally, the agreements reached on a number of urgent international problems the settlement of which would contribute tremendously to the consolidation of peace and detente are of important significance. This applies above all to the coincidence of positions, as stated in the declaration, on the nature of the meeting of representatives of ministers of foreign affairs in Belgrade. Both parties expressed the hope that this meeting will take place in a constructive spirit and will make a specific contribution to progress in the implementation of the stipulations of the Final Act.

The parties further emphasized the importance of the quadripartite accord on West Berlin concluded on 3 September 1971, stating that its strict observance and full implementation will be a guarantee of stability in this area; they noted the coincidence of their views concerning the problem of Cyprus and formulated joint positions related to it; they expressed their satisfaction with the fact that their coinciding positions on the basic problems of a Middle Eastern settlement are now gaining wide approval; they confirmed the joint view that the peoples of Africa have the right to resolve their destinies freely, without outside interference. They expressed their support of the right of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia to exercise self-determination and independence as rapidly as possible, and they condemned the apartheid policy in South Africa.

All of this confirms again and again that the policy of accord and cooperation between the USSR and France is now, in the final quarter of the 20th century, a permanent policy governing their relations, and a permanent and beneficial factor in international life.

For Further Development of Cooperation

Naturally, such a permanent policy has a positive influence on bilateral business relations between the USSR and France in all areas -- economic, trade, scientific, and cultural, and in the field of contacts among people. The new accords concluded as a result of the visit, with a view to developing and intensifying cooperation between the USSR and France in the areas of politics, trade, industry, and science and technology, will contribute to the further development of such relations.

This was extensively and properly stated in the course of the truly warm encounters between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and the French members of parliament and the heads of the France-USSR Society, in which I, along with my French colleagues, had the honor of participating.

An uplifting and happy atmosphere prevailed in the spacious hall of the Soviet Embassy where the meeting was held. Assembled here were the most noted leaders of the National Assembly and the Senate, representatives of literally all political parties and business circles, writers, artists, war veterans and members of the France-USSR Society. All of them spoke with great warmth of the substantial successes achieved in the development of the relations between the two countries.

This included the fact that in 10 years, for example, the volume of trade between our countries had increased by eight times; scientific cooperation between them, particularly in leading areas such as nuclear physics and space research, is developing actively; and cultural exchange has taken on a truly all-embracing nature.

A new decade of Franco-Soviet cooperation is beginning now, and new opportunities have developed. We may have to look farther ahead. Therefore, as suggested by L. I. Brezhnev, it was decided to undertake the drafting of a new long-term program for the intensification of Franco-Soviet cooperation in the field of economics and industry for the period through 1990.

In the course of my stay in France, I had the opportunity to talk with noted representatives of practically all political trends. Literally all of them, including the president of the National Assembly, the radical Edgar Faure, the centrist (Poer), president of the Senate, Gaullists Joxe and Vigier, heading the groups of friendship with the USSR in the National Assembly and the Senate, Mitterand, first secretary of the Socialist Party, and Fitterman, member of the French Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, spoke in favor of further broadening comprehensive cooperation with our country, emphasizing that such cooperation is consistent with the basic national interests of France.

At that time, only dyed-in-the-wool fascists belonging to the "party of new forces," allied with Zionists and provocateurs from petty left-wing groups oriented toward Peking allowed themselves to stage "demonstrations" against Franco-Soviet cooperation. Curiously, the mass information media, rivaling their overseas patrons, made a great deal of such hooliganistic tricks.

The newspapers published motley photographs of several dozen fascist toughs swaggering along the Champs Elysees. All of this was described as "freedom of expression," even though the public opinion survey conducted prior to the visit paid by the important Soviet guest showed that 88% of the French people welcomed a stronger friendship with the USSR.

What can we say about this? Apparently, the instinct of class hatred for communism on the part of those who encourage and popularize anti-Soviet

sallies suppresses their understanding of the profound national interests of France so well expressed by the representatives of the French public at their meeting with Comrade L. I. Brezhnev.

"In World War II, our people fought fascism jointly," said de Gaulle's fellow worker, former French ambassador to Moscow Louis Joxe. "We must be just as united in the struggle for peace, detente, agreement, and cooperation based on mutual respect."

"We were accorded the honor of being received by the head of the Soviet state, whose heroic forces turned our hope into confidence by destroying the myth of the invincibility of the fascist armies, at Stalingrad, for the whole world to see," said Senator J.-L. Vigier, a former active participant in the resistance movement. "The peoples of our two countries fought because they fell victims to aggression. We do not wish for our children to experience that which we experienced. It is the warm wish of everyone present here that your visit will contribute to the further strengthening of our friendship and progress along the path of peace."

Warm applause immediately broke out in the hall...

The Soviet parliamentarians, the members of the USSR-France Society, the entire Soviet public, the whole of our people fully share the wishes expressed by the French parliamentarians and heads of the France-USSR Society at their meeting with the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

The visit paid by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to France is regarded by both the Soviet and the French people as a major new contribution to the strengthening of the traditional friendship between the peoples of our two countries, a friendship which is an important guarantee of the firmness of the positive changes achieved in their relations.

Franco-Soviet interaction in the struggle for strengthening detente and peace has as yet unused and major potential. These possibilities lie in the all-round cooperation between the USSR and France in the fields of economics, science, and culture. The Soviet public hopes that this potential will be fully utilized in the course of the implementation of the new accords concluded in Rambouillet.

5003

CSO: 1802

SOME TRENDS IN FOREIGN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 106-114

[Article by A. Manfred, doctor of historical sciences; written for KOMMUNIST shortly before the author's death]

[Text] The science of history is one of the social disciplines most closely linked with contemporaneity and with today's political and ideological struggle. This is so obvious as to require no particular explanation, for any political program or ideological concept must take into account the lessons of historical experience.

It is not this statement which triggers disputes or differences; in its abstract form, it is probably acceptable to nearly everyone. Arguments, or more accurately put, acute ideological struggles, develop when we begin to interpret the link between the science of history and contemporaneity and to determine the ways and means of resolving such arguments and determining the specific meaning of Clio's ancient science.

Unquestionably, new phenomena and new trends have appeared in the past decade in foreign historiography -- some clearer, others as yet unformed, and still others deliberately concealed. Actually, these new processes in historical science are for the most part the indirect reflection of the struggle between the forces of socialism, social progress and peace, and the opposing forces of imperialism and reaction, and a reflection of the changes which have taken place in the ratio of these forces on an international scale, with all the resulting consequences affecting their balance.

The limitations of this article make it impossible to describe or even to enumerate all or even the most important trends in contemporary foreign historiography; the author's task is different: merely to discuss some trends in foreign historiography deserving the attention of the public, without at all laying claim to comprehensive coverage of all the new processes.

The first thing we must consider, and, to a certain and even a substantial extent it is the starting point for understanding what will follow, is the undoubted growth -- quantitative and qualitative -- in the influence of

Marxism on foreign historical publications. (Here and subsequently, it will be a question not of the historiography of the members of the socialist comity, but of the countries in the capitalist world.)

This growth of Marxist influence is seen, above all, in its external and visible forms obvious to all. Looking in bookstore windows in the large Western cities, one can see the works of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin, translated into the respective languages and published not in Moscow by the Progress Publishing House, but here, locally, and mostly by bourgeois publishing houses. No such thing occurred 10 years ago. The works of the Marxist-Leninist classics and other books by Marxist communist authors come from the presses of the bourgeois publishing houses not because their owners have become supporters of Marx and Lenin, but because there is a demand for such publications, so that consequently this is profitable.

There is no need to look far to find examples. The Fayard bourgeois publishing house published the six-volume (seven books) memoirs of Jacques Duclos (Jacques Duclos, "Memoires," I-VI, Fayard, Paris, 1968-1972). This publication was noted not only by the progressive press, but by the "big" bourgeois press as well. The penultimate major work by Jacques Duclos, "Bakunin and Marx, Shadow and Light," dealing with the history of Marx's struggle against Bakunin, was published by the most solid "classical" super-bourgeois publishing house, Plon. Once it published only the works of the most influential and prestigious members of the ruling classes. For example in the 1920's, Plon published the multiple-volume memoirs of Raymond Poincare, former president of the republic and prime minister. Well, times change! Instead of Poincare, this publishing house is now printing books by Jacques Duclos, a member of the French Communist Party Politburo. A number of similar examples could be cited.

Similar processes are taking place in the universities. At the university in Paris (formerly the Sorbonne), the world-famous Chair of History of the Great French Revolution, held in the past by Alfonse Olard, Albert Mathiez and Georges Lefebvr, has for a number of years been held by the communist Albert Soboul. This is no isolated case. The Marxist historians Jean (Brua), Jean Bouvier, Claude Villard, Pierre Villard, Jacques Proust, Roland Prampe, and others are successfully working in French universities.

A similar picture can be seen in Italy. The famous professors and Marxist historians Aladri and Procacci play a considerable role in the country's universities. In faraway Japan, at Tokyo University, Marxist historian Takahashi and his students played a leading role for a number of years. The list could be extended, and we could name other famous Marxist historians or scientists close to Marxism in Britain, the United States, Belgium, the FRG, Canada, Australia, and other capitalist countries.

Naturally, it would be erroneous to assume that there are no debatable problems or differences of opinion on one problem in historiography or another among Marxist historians abroad. There would be no progress in thinking or movement ahead without such creative debates and discussions of unresolved problems.

The great and fruitful influence which Marxism-Leninism continues to exert on the development of the views of a number of scientists who have not as yet converted entirely to its positions but who listen with great attention to the voices of their colleagues who are Marxist historians, and who respect Marxist-Leninist thinking is universally known.

This process could be most clearly illustrated by taking as an example French historiography, which is incidentally playing perhaps the leading role in contemporary foreign historiography. Who can forget the considerable influence of Marxist ideas and the historical experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the works of Albert Mathiez and Georges Lefebvr, the greatest French historians of the 20th century! Initially both of them were under the influence of the theories of scientific socialism not on the direct basis of its founders, but as interpreted by Jean Jaures. His "Socialist History of the French Revolution," published at the beginning of the 20th century, was the work through which the progressive French scientists felt for the first time the powerful force of Marx's thoughts. Mathiez and Lefebvr considered themselves -- and so asserted in a number of statements -- as students of Jean Jaures. Subsequently, the October Revolution and the historical experience in the building of socialism in our country had a direct impact on the methodology, way of thinking and historical concepts of Albert Mathiez and Georges Lefebvr.

Could these outstanding historians be described as Marxists? To judge from all appearances, no. Yet it would be impossible to reject the tremendous influence of Marxism on their scientific creativity. They are justifiably described as progressive scientists who experienced the favorable influence of the ideas of scientific socialism. With substantial modifications, the same could be said of the senior generation of the major French historians -- Lucien Fevre, Mark Block, creators of the journal ANNALES, and Fernand (Brodele). Lucien Fevre and Mark Block date from the past. However, Fernand Brodele is one of the greatest and most prestigious contemporary French historians, and the author of a large two-volume work on the Mediterranean area in the Middle Ages, and on capitalism and material living conditions in the 15th-18th centuries. He is a very original scientist who tries to establish his own historical synthesis in all matters. He has repeatedly and openly proclaimed the significance he ascribes to Marxist theory. In one of his speeches Brodele said: "It is as clear as the fact that two and two make four that Marx is the originator of contemporary historical science."

Fernand Brodele came to the Soviet Union and prefaced the scientific paper he read at the Institute of General History of the USSR Academy of Sciences with a characteristic statement: "If I am described as and termed a bourgeois scientist, I shall leave and will not speak."

Our friend the French progressive historian Claude Villard quite recently and almost categorically demanded that Marxist historians entirely abandon the term "bourgeois scientist." I would not go so far as Claude Villard, since this term rightfully exists, as can be demonstrated by examples based

on the works of a number of foreign historians. However, in my view the thought of our French comrade contains a grain of truth. Occasionally we too hastily and categorically term one scientist or another as wearing a certain cap. But reality demonstrates that a number of major scientists are under the influence of the ideological struggle taking place today throughout the world. Some seem to stop halfway: able to understand the great creative force of Marxist theory, but not as yet fully accepting the Marxist doctrine. The process is incomplete, and they themselves are in a state of motion.

The works of such scientists contain both references to Marx and to other non-Marxist or anti-Marxist thinkers. In their introduction to the four-volume collective work "The Social and Economic History of France," edited by Fernand Brodele and Ernst Labrousse, they refer to the extensive dissemination of Marxist ideas in contemporary science. Yet these same authors would cite Keynes as well.

Academician Pierre Renouvin, the great recently deceased specialist in the history of international relations and diplomacy, had without a doubt experienced the influence of the Marxist method. He demanded that the study of the history of diplomacy and the development of international relations not be limited to the Soviet documents created in the quiet of ministerial offices. Could he be considered a Marxist? Naturally not. However, we cannot ignore the desire of the scientist to go beyond the narrow framework of the positivistic school, to a certain extent, and find a more fruitful methodological base for the solution of the problems facing him.

But in discussing Pierre Renouvin we are speaking of the past. The only reason for mentioning him is to emphasize that at the present stage in the acute ideological struggle and of the ever-greater increase in the role of Marxist-Leninist ideas, it would probably be hardly accurate or useful to use exceptionally rigid or broad classifications, or to abandon the differentiated, specific, and, if one so wishes to put it, individual and unprejudiced approach to the study of the works of one major historian or another. Obviously, we should take the actual state of affairs in historiography into account, in which individual major scientists who are not politically Marxists and who differ from the Marxists on one specific problem or another remain supporters of progressive thinking to a certain extent, and very possibly may be potential future allies. The experience acquired by the Soviet scientists in the past few years indicates, as confirmed by practical experience, that within certain clearly demarcated borders, scientific cooperation between Soviet historians and foreign historians who offer us a friendly hand is possible.

This does not by any means indicate that we are abandoning the clarity and consistency of our class and ideological-political positions. Quite the opposite: it is precisely the rejection of any kind of scientific sectarianism which would create favorable prerequisites for the gradual conversion to such positions on the part of the most progressive and responsibly thinking foreign colleagues.

Yet we cannot fail to note that other noteworthy trends are developing in contemporary foreign historiography. In this article we will not take up the open enemies of Marxism, the anti-Soviets and anticommunists who frankly attack Marxism and progressive Marxist-Leninist science. We are not discussing them, but we know who they are, and no illusions can be entertained in this connection. They are the opponents of social progress and of the policy of peace and detente. They are our ideological enemies and we should treat them as such. Here we are discussing something else.

In recent years, a certain trend has developed among foreign historians who have considered themselves in their time to be left of center, and who have occasionally published works worthy of support: gradually their positions moved in a single direction -- from left to right. These historians are not trying to publicize their anticommunist and anti-Marxist feelings. They are pursuing their struggle against Marxist-Leninist methodology in a more refined manner. On one occasion or another, they are ready to voice seemingly entirely sympathetic statements. In their time, most of them have become familiar with the works of Marx and Engels and the works of progressive Soviet and foreign historians. They could not in any way be suspected of ignorance or lack of preparedness. Rather the opposite, as some of them once underwent Marxist training. Now they claim to "stand above" Marxism. Numerous examples of this could be cited, and this statement could be illustrated with specific facts.

Let us carefully consider the works of British historian Richard Cobb. In his time, his works were positively assessed by the progressive press, both foreign and Soviet, and to tell the truth, he deserved it. As an Oxford University professor, Richard Cobb specialized in the history of the great French Revolution, studying primarily the role of left-wing political groups in it, particularly at its higher, Jacobin stage. He was the author of a two-volume definitive work on the revolutionary army, based on extensive and previously unknown archive data (Richard Cobb, "Les Armees Revolutionnaires" [The Revolutionary Armies], Vols I and II, Paris, 1960-1963). This monograph, which was highly assessed in the progressive scientific press, was published in 1960-1963. Much water has flowed down the Thames since then, and it is as though in the past few years the author of this work has imperceptibly undergone a certain reversal. As a historian, his attention began to be drawn more not to manifestations of revolutionary valor, selflessness, and courage displayed by simple Frenchmen, peasants, artisans, etc., who defended their country against the invasion by interventionists and from the internal counterrevolution, but to other subjects. He began to publish studies on one violation of the law or another, arbitrary acts and violence, and gradually, little by little, the picture he created began to be noted for the primarily dark and exaggerated colors according to the author's will.

It would be unnecessary to trace the whole of the evolution of Richard Cobb. Briefly stated, this author, who had had such a successful beginning, began shortly afterward to convert from a conscientious historian of the exploits of the French people during the revolution into

a defamer of it. Cobb's latest works are a slander against the French people and their revolution, a slander against the history of a heroic liberation struggle. I have never read nor come across any of Cobb's statements concerning his views. However, his work shows that from a progressive representative of progressive historical science, he converted to a malicious enemy of it. Let us state frankly that Cobb's latest works and his work as a whole are of no scientific value, for the author's attention is focused not on the historical processes which moved social development forward, and not on the heroic struggle of the French people, but on the collection of real or imaginary facts about violations of the principles of civic-mindedness.

It is noteworthy that Richard Cobb's metamorphosis -- his left to right shift -- did not go unnoticed in some academic circles. Previously, when Cobb was writing scientific books inspired by noble and progressive motivations, he had certain publishing difficulties. With some obstacles, he had to publish them himself in France, in the French language, as they were not being printed in his own language, English. Today the situation is different. His books are published in Britain and then in Paris, in their French translations. Emmanuel Leroi Ladurie, a professor at the College de France, of whom we shall speak later, published a highly laudatory review in LE MONDE of a book by this historian in its French translation. Richard Cobb is becoming a fashionable author.

Here is another example. Two other authors -- F. (Fure) and D. Richet -- until recently classified among the young, and who, in their time, had also had Marxist training, "enriched" the science of history not so long ago with a two-volume work. It was modestly entitled "Revolution." Not the great revolution, the French Revolution, but simply "revolution." However, the modesty of the title perfectly matched the exceptionally lavish presentation. The two volumes issued by the Hachette Publishing House were printed on such splendid paper, with such an abundance of colored illustrations and engravings, and a binding and dust jacket long-since abandoned in French historical publications. Actually, in order for this work, too expensive for the mass customer, to become more widespread, a more modest edition was published soon afterward, in a pocket-book format, intended to "educate" a considerably broader readership.

What is the meaning and purpose of this work? Neither of these historians was a specialist in the French Revolution, a branch of historical knowledge which has reached such a high level of development that without specialized and thorough training one could hardly contribute anything new or of scientific value to the interpretation of its problems. The prudent authors failed to equip their books with scientific tools. To give things their proper name, such books pursue political and propaganda rather than scientific purposes.

It is no accident that the authors refuse to describe the French Revolution as "great," as it has been described for a little less than 200 years, and as it was always described by Lenin. From their viewpoint, this revolution

was not historically inevitable and necessary. Reading this narration, one would think that the revolution was somewhat accidental, the result of the accumulation of a number of errors. Had the representatives of the old regime, the monarchy of Louis XVI, been more daring and clever, and had they made a few timely reforms, there would have been no revolution.

Questioning the historical necessity and legitimacy of the revolution which overthrew the feudal-absolutist system in France, they step by step describe the course of events and provide an ever more critical assessment of the revolutionary creativity of the masses. They aim their weapons at the higher, the Jacobin stage of the revolution. The book is polemic. Even though Lenin is not mentioned by name, the book is directed against Lenin's concept, Lenin's high assessment of the Jacobin dictatorship and of Jacobinism as a whole. According to (Fure) and Richet, the Jacobin stage in the French Revolution, considered with full justification in the Marxist-Leninist view as the highest stage in its development, becomes a chain of accidents and errors. The authors present matters as though the Jacobin stage was groundless in general. Using the slang of racing car drivers, they claim that at that stage, revolutionary France "skidded," and that "the car drifted farther than necessary." Naturally, after such an interpretation of the most heroic and fruitful stage in the French Revolution, the counterrevolutionary coup d'etat of 9 Thermidor (27 June 1794) becomes a fully justified and, perhaps, even noble act, which allegedly saved the country from the "arbitrary actions and violence" of the extreme revolutionaries.

In turn, the British historian (Cobben) questions the historical necessity of the revolution itself. Why was it necessary? Who needed it? These questions are willingly repeated by his students and followers. Matters have reached the point at which rhetorical questions are asked: was there a revolution at all? Did it have any real meaning in history?

At the 14th International Congress of Historical Sciences, in an extensive report written by a number of scientists and edited by the well-known French historian Professor Roland (Mounie), the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen was hardly mentioned. In his final speech of conclusion, Professor R. (Mounie) deemed it more suitable to refer to the "authority" of the Apostle Paul than to the respective articles in the declaration formulated in the "First Year of Freedom" -- 1789.

The question naturally arises: what, in fact, led to such belated extreme irritation and hostility toward the Great French Revolution? Why is it that 15 years before the celebration of that revolution's bicentennial, bourgeois in its objective content and final results, but popular and democratic by its nature, a revolution which became great precisely thanks to the decisive role of the popular masses -- why is it that it is regarded as fashionable to attack it all along the front precisely now?

The answer is quite simple: the darts directed at the 18th century French Revolution are aimed beyond it -- at the Great October Socialist Revolution

and the powerful Soviet Union, the world socialist system, the workers and national liberation movements, and all democratic and progressive forces to which the future of mankind is tied.

Historians who continue to describe themselves as young, even though all of them are already close to the half century mark or may even have passed it, intend not only to reinterpret and reassess the values of the past which are universally acknowledged by progressive historical thinking. They are ready to express a "new" opinion on other matters, on matters of methodology. These "young" French historians who are currently rallying around the journal ANNALES, former students of Fernand Brodele, impatient to separate themselves from their teacher and to establish an entirely independent group, are trying to become famous as the founders of a new theoretical doctrine, a new historical theory. We find among them the same (Fure) and Richet. However, it is not they who wear the halo of leadership of the new current. The apostle of the "new" school is Emmanuel Leroi Ladurie, a professor at the College de France. This young professor cannot claim to be unfamiliar with Marxist theory and with progressive scientific thinking. He too, in his time, had Marxist training. However, he deemed it necessary to part with it. Leroi Ladurie wants to introduce something new into the science of history and, with no excessive modesty, would prefer to be known as a "post-Marxist."

What is the essence of such views? Leroi Ladurie and his supporters tend to accuse Marxism of one-sidedness. Marxism, they allege, ascribes excessive significance to economic and social factors and, as they acknowledge "generously," played a positive role in its time. However, in the view of the supporters of "post-Marxism," this is a past stage. The historian must not only take into account the factors mentioned 100 years ago by Marx, but must bear in mind a number of other factors, allegedly unseen by Marxist historians. Among them, Leroi Ladurie and his friends give priority to the study of climatic changes, geographic environments, and external conditions which have surrounded man throughout human history.

Unquestionably, the study of the climate in the past could be of interest to researchers. However, no excessive importance should be ascribed to such factors, with which, incidentally, the science of history has long been familiar. When Leroi Ladurie, in his role as "innovator," tries not without enthusiasm to demonstrate the importance of the study of geographic environment and the geographic and physical complex surrounding man, he fails to realize the rather awkward position in which he puts himself. As we know, 200 years before him, the role of geographic environment was pointed out by Montesquieu; some 100 years ago, G. V. Plekhanov, rightly agreeing with Montesquieu that geographic environment should naturally be taken into account by the historian, explained with equal thoroughness that this factor should not become dominant in the historical process, and that this environment is a variable factor which will exert a different influence on human society depending on the development of production forces. Let us also recall that 100 years ago Plekhanov described the way in which the role of the oceans changed with alterations in the level of progress and the growth of production forces on dry land.

The supporters of that "progressive" method do not limit themselves to attempts to pass off an unsold commodity as the latest novelty in historical thinking. They go further. A characteristic feature of the scientific practice of these historians involves breaking down the overall historical process into a number of localized and artificially separated trends. The supporters of this method would like to present the historical process as a sum total of components: some of them involve economic history; others involve demographic changes occurring in society; yet others have to do with political history or culture; and so on. The organically integral multiple-level historical process is thus broken down into a series of independent and unconnected individual processes.

Furthermore, the supporters of "post-Marxism" do not consider a broad historical survey of the past, or of a lengthy segment of time, as the most preferable, but an isolated, localized study of a small area, of a province, or of an even smaller territory.

The supporters of the new trend praise to the skies their leader's monograph on the socioeconomic development of Languedoc in the 14th century. No one would argue that such a local study is justified, and that it might be well or poorly developed. It is quite possible that Leroi Ladurie resolved the problem of his doctoral dissertation successfully with this topic. The subject of the disagreement is not whether such works are admissible. The argument arises when such studies are generalized and proclaimed to be practically fundamental to historical science.

Also noteworthy is the desire of the representatives of this current to give priority to quantitative methods in historiography. They assume that a change in the science of history becomes possible through the use of computers and other calculating machines, and that everything can be computed. Without a doubt computers have some merit. Used within sensible limits they play a useful role, without question. However, when proclaimed to be the basis of the science of history, everything else falls by the wayside. Left to themselves, these "young" scientists would flood the book market with statistical summaries. To a certain extent, such summaries may be useful. The trouble is that in this flood of occasionally chaotic or poorly systematized figures, the integral historical process vanishes.

A consideration of the results of such "new" methods, if systematically and logically applied in practical work, would clearly show that they lead to a rejection of historical summation and synthesis. Their supporters do not conceal their dislike of synthesis. They do not need summations. They try to break the historical process down into individual bits and parts, so that the reader who tries to derive certain lessons from the past for the present, and to understand the past, would be unable to do so. If there is no integral historical concept or process, there are no historical patterns. The final purpose of this interpretation is to promote mistrust of the idea developed in progressive historical thinking of historical laws and the deterministic nature of the historical process.

From this viewpoint as well, such "new" trends must be studied critically and surmounted. They hinder the progress of worldwide historical science and its truly scientific trends, which are becoming ever-stronger and clearer.

DESPOTISM WITHOUT A MASK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 115-121

[Article by S. Zivs]

[Text] Currently many odious persons are actively engaged in defending so-called Western democracy. This includes Italian neofascists, Portuguese right-wingers, NATO generals, and Thai policemen. This company is as heterogeneous as it is loud, openly claiming the attention of world public opinion.

The voices of the Chilean fascists who, to the surprise of everyone, lay a claim to becoming the leading soloists, are particularly shrill in this disharmonious choir. Executioners whose hands are red with the blood of hundreds and thousands of Chilean patriots, and professional suppressors of freedom are becoming all of a sudden the most zealous "guardians" of human rights! Is this not a perverse irony? Here is one of them, Colonel Jorge Espinosa. He was the commandant of the concentration camp at the National Stadium in Santiago where in the first weeks and months following the military coup d'etat mass dealings with democrats took place. From December 1973 to the present Espinosa has been director of the National Executive Secretariat For Prisoners' Affairs. He is directly in charge of all concentration camps for political prisoners. It was precisely he who told the world in an interview that the Chilean regime is using special repressive measures ("the only ones capable of insuring tranquility and social peace") for the sole purpose of defending "Western civilization."

The junta is promoting the "Messianic" purpose of the political system it has established which, allegedly, must become no more and no less than an "example for the entire world." One of Chile's military dictators, General Gustavo Leigh, proclaims "the historical mission which God has put in our hands." The junta's regime, he states, must become a "light illuminating the path to progress."

Naturally, the blasphemy of such shouts is not that someone has encroached on the "holies" of Western democracy which fully deserves the sentence of historical doom. It would be difficult to invent anything which exposes more the infamous "free world" than the monstrous mixture of tragedy and farce: the Chilean junta in the vanguard of the defenders of Western democracy.

It would be unnecessary to prove extensively that the big speeches by the Chilean fascists about democracy are a model of political and social demagoguery inherent in any fascism whatever its national coloring. The Chilean fascists overthrew by the force of arms the constitutional government of President Salvador Allende, destroyed the system of constitutional institutions, and violated constitutional basic civil rights. As Comrade A. P. Kirilenko noted at the meeting with Comrade Luis Corvalan, held in Moscow on 4 January 1977, "The cruel and bloody measures are accompanied by cynical talk of support of the 'ideals of humanism,' and 'freedom of the individual'."

According to the newly proclaimed "theoreticians" how is the "crisis in the system of classical democracy" manifested? It appears that, according to them, bourgeois democracy has become "senile" since it is "no longer able to deal with Marxism." "Engaging in a dialogue and playing with Marxism, the West is moving toward suicide," warned one of the leading ideologues of the junta and professor at the Higher National Security Academy (there is such an "academy" in this police state!) and personal advisor of Pinochet, Jaime Guzman, who participated in the elaboration of the basic "constitutional" acts of the regime.

The junta leadership is trying to convince its partners that the model of the "new democracy" must be adopted everywhere and become a standard for the political organization of the "free world." The junta has taken the initiative of a "frontal offensive" against Marxism "for the sake of saving the West," boasts Pinochet. General Leigh philosophizes about the "decisive significance which Chile has acquired as the first democratic country to reject Red suppression." In the "building of democracy," Leigh proclaims, "we are in the vanguard of the world."

Thus, the junta is trying to present its cannibalistic policy as a model for the future development of the "free world." True, its excessive directness shocks some people in the West. Such admissions hardly suit the political leaders and theoreticians of bourgeois democracy to whom Pinochet and his followers would like to give orders. Even the secret admirers and supporters of the junta would prefer that its ideological credo not be voiced so clearly.

The junta opposes not only the traditional institutions of bourgeois democracy but the concepts on which its foundations are based. Is this not confirmed by banning and removing from Chilean university libraries the books by the French political expert Maurice Duverger, the Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal, and the American economist John Galbraith?

After bonfires of books by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and the leaders of the Popular Unity Party were set on the streets of Santiago, the junta decided to "streamline" book censorship even further. Many world classics were taken out of circulation, as was officially stated, "because of their Marxist content, propaganda value, or nature conflicting with the ideals which inspire the military junta." This included works by Maksim Gor'kiy, F. M. Dostoyevskiy, Jack London, Thomas Mann, A. S. Pushkin, and Herbert Wells. Yet, as was reported on 19 April 1976 by the fascist unofficial newspaper EL MERCURIO, Luis Velasco, secretary of the superintendency of education, ordered the printing of additional issues of the "Selected Speeches by Hitler and Mussolini for teaching purposes based on the new school curriculum." For the same purposes 2 years earlier a second printing of the work by Pinochet himself, "Geopolitics," was published, consisting essentially of a compilation of the ideas of Karl Haushoffer, a Nazi professor and SS general.

The international public angrily condemned the Chilean fascist regime. In its resolution the 31st United Nations General Assembly once again and most firmly condemned the junta's system of "constant and obvious violations of human rights, including the institutionalized practice of torture, cruel, inhuman, and undignified behavior and punishments and arbitrary detentions."

A voluminous report of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission--a consultative organ of the OAS--was submitted for consideration by the Sixth General Assembly of the Organization of American States. It spoke of the continuing crimes committed by the Pinochet Regime--tortures, murders, and "disappearances" of prisoners.

On the basis of the study and evaluation of tremendous documentary data the International Commission investigating the crimes of the Chilean military junta reached the conclusion that "unrestrained terrorism rules the country."

However, the "theoretical" thinking of the fascists is developing regardless of these or other facts. What is this so-called "new institutional order" for Chile as depicted by the members of the junta themselves?

Essentially, it is based on the authoritarian principle which calls for the blind and strict obedience on the part of the population to any decision of the authorities. This is a typical feature of any type of fascism. The junta and its ideologues are openly flaunting the tyrannical nature of Chilean "democracy." Authoritarianism is the pivot of the new "order" which is manifested above all in the total lack of control over the authorities and over their "political" decisions. Gusman emphasizes this in particular. "We consider it inevitable," he said, "for the new democracy to strengthen the principles of authoritarianism." The legal position of the individual, according to Gusman, should depend exclusively on political rather than legal decisions. The supreme bearer of the executive power would decide whether or not one or another citizen is "dangerous" to the state (in which case he must be "preventively" deprived of his freedom).

"The use of the authoritarian principle is an imperative for the junta," said Pinochet himself, repeating after Guzman. "The government of the armed forces and the security forces will energetically implement the authoritarian principle." It must "rule with full awareness of authoritarianism" for the sake of the "full restoration of the principle of authoritarianism."

Thus, the authoritarian will of the junta stands above all. Its practical embodiment and manifestation is absolute arbitrariness, proclaimed as the supreme principle and supreme state norm, unlimited by any constitutional principle, law, or norm of international law.

Naturally, there is nothing to be amazed at. As early as 11 September 1973, issuing the order to shell La Moneda, the president's palace, Pinochet proclaimed that "the time of parliaments has ended." Ten days later the parliament was dissolved with decree No 27 "On Dissolving the National Congress." Along with the parliament the fascist dictatorship destroyed also the traditional Chilean system of political parties. General Leigh substantiated this "theoretically." Speaking at Catholic University, he stated that "the so-called system of parties within the framework of parliamentarianism...is consistent with an obsolete system which is experiencing a progressing crisis throughout the world." An authoritarian antiparliamentary system without political parties, Leigh specified, is the prototype of the "modern and purged democracy," whose establishment, preceding other countries, was Chile's "privilege."

Indeed, why does the junta need a parliament, elections, political parties, or trade union freedoms? Any form of political activity by the people is a mortal danger to the fascist system which is kept in Chile exclusively through mass terror and a system of cruel coercion.

The junta's ideologues do not leave unanswered the question of who should have full "authoritarian power." In an editorial the semiofficial *EL MERCURIO* cited the words of General Hermann Brady, minister of national defense: "The army is the backbone supporting the sacred values of the nation and around which the country's institutions are developing." One month after the September 1976 publication of the "constitutional acts" which contained a number of demagogical tirades concerning freedom, democracy, and so on, a "theoretical" trial balloon was launched: "In reality the new institutions do not depend on formulas but on the basis for governmental power and the way it is allocated." Shortly afterwards the junta's ideologues answered the question of the real source of power as follows: "The source of power is rooted in the armed forces."

This closes the circle of "theoretical" exercises concerning the nature of the "new democracy"--a "prototype" of a worldwide political system wished by the reaction. The roots of power are found in the armed forces. The power itself is exercised through the army structure. The "new democracy" is nothing but a military dictatorship, while the army's commander in chief personifies the supreme authoritarian power. He is the chief of the military junta, the "president" of the country, and the "supreme head of the nation."

It is no accident that the junta's "theoreticians" use Hitler's jargon with the help of which the Nazis cultivate the "fuhrer" idea. "Whoever commands the army has full power," frankly state the newly proclaimed "theoreticians" of authoritarianism. The army's controlling and repressive function is regulated by junta decrees to the smallest detail. The country is in a permanent state of siege. The military commanders of the "state of siege zones" into which the entire country has been divided have the right to press, telegraph, and radio-telephone censorship. They have the duty to "suppress antipatriotic propaganda and its dissemination by the press and by the radio, motion pictures, theater, or any other media."

As conceived by Pinochet the army is the "backbone" of the new democracy, the very foundation of the power, and the guardian angel of "Western culture." The interference of the military in cultural life, schools, and university education is expressed in the implementation of banning and control-censorship functions. It is precisely this aspect that is emphasized by Colonel E. Reyes, the junta-appointed "rector" of the Chilean State Technical University, speaking of the "intervention of the armed forces in academic life." However, the purpose of the "intervention" in the realm of culture is also aimed at stupefying the growing generation. Admiral Hugo Castro, the junta's minister of education, formulated it with the same type of punching directness: "Less sociologists, philosophers, and educators." This shows not only the traditional dislike by the soldiery of the humanities but the aspiration to deprive the young people of the possibility to assess social phenomena on the basis of scientific analyses.

The Pinochet regime is largely a repetition of the fascism of the 1930's and 1940's not only in terms of the methods for the promotion of terrorism and violence but the types of ideological influence used on the population.

The usurpers hated by the people are trying to create the appearance that the people are united around the junta. To this purpose the slogan of "National Unity" is being extensively exploited. A cult of nationalism, and various verbal variance of the "nationalistic inspiration" are inseparable features of Chilean neofascism.

The junta openly gambles on the verbal similarity between the slogan of "National Unity" and the concept of popular unity. The period of deep social changes which took place in the course of the 13 years of rule by the government of President Salvador Allende was linked in the minds of the Chilean people with the platform of the popular unity--the bloc of revolutionary, progressive, and truly popular forces. Popular unity is today as well a symbol of the struggle against the fascist regime. "All the parties of the popular unity are continuing to act and struggle in Chile," noted Luis Corvalan in one of his addresses.

In reality, the military-fascist regime which is demagogically exploiting the slogans of defending the supreme interests of the Chilean nation, is an antipatriotic conspiracy of supporters of national treason. It was imposed upon the country with the support of foreign imperialism and is insuring the

economic domination of Chile by international monopolies. As Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the 25th CPSU Congress the conspiracy by the Chilean reaction was planned and paid for, as is now universally known by foreign imperialism.

The junta's ideologues frequently reconcile nationalistic cliches with mysticism, speculating on the religious feelings of a considerable segment of the Chilean population. The "Declaration of Principles" program states that "the junta respects the Christian world concept and its perception of man and society." The junta's assertions of "respect" for the Christian concept of man are nothing but demagoguery concealing the mockery of the human dignity and personality. The primitive nature of its speculations is obvious. Thus, the junta's representative to the Vatican H. Riesle undertook to substantiate in EL MERCURIO the "natural" and "God-pleasing" obedience to the junta by the Chilean citizens. Natural law, he expounds, leads to the acknowledgement of the junta, for the normal mind orders us to obey conscientiously the legitimate powers and follow their instructions. Divine right, as preached by Saint Paul, states that legitimate power is granted by God...

Actually, the junta's members do not avoid discussing the divine sources of their power. General Leigh obviously states that the junta came to power "by divine command." Pinochet claims that the mandate to rule the country was given to the "armed forces and public order forces by the secret hand of divine providence." The head of the junta and commander in chief of the army has also named himself Chilean president and, as a new "fuhrer," delivered a speech stating that "divine providence deemed it suitable" for him to be "anointed" (!!) to the position of supreme head of the Chilean nation. It is easy to see that the origins of such pseudoreligious revelations may be traced to the clerical fascism which was actively cultivated in the 1930's in Italy, Spain, and even Germany.

The junta's chiefs and ideologues are promoting all over the thesis of the allegedly above-class nature and all-national sources of their system. They are endlessly repeating terms such as "national soul," "nationalistic concept of the state," and "national doctrine of power," in order to create the appearance that the Chilean citizens are united on the platform of "national self-awareness." "The Chilean people cannot be classified into presumed caste differences or social classes, for they acknowledge a single blood heritage..." Pinochet has stated. To him class antagonism is no more than the result of the "invasion of foreign culture." The junta has even tried to ban legally the very idea of class contradictions. Pinochet has stated that the proclamation of "constitutional acts" means an official ban of "any concept of society based on the class struggle." In "Constitutional Act No 2" of the "Foundations of the Chilean Institutional System" decrees the abandonment of the "concept of society resting on the ferment of social antagonisms" (Art 1). Any form of dissemination of scientific concepts concerning modern bourgeois society is proclaimed illegal: "Any action on the part of individuals or groups of individuals aimed at disseminating... the concept based on the class struggle is illegal" ("Constitutional Act No 3," Preamble, Point 12).

The fact that the junta's wedge of nationalistic demagogy is directed against Marxism-Leninism has its own logic. One of its decrees stipulates that "the Marxist doctrine of the state and the class struggle is incompatible with the concept of national unity served by the armed forces and the public order forces of Chile...."

Decree No 1 of 11 September 1973 proclaiming the establishment of the junta and its power seizure already spoke of "foreign Marxist-Leninist principles" allegedly aimed at the "destruction" of the higher values of the Chilean nation. Pinochet himself expounded on the theme that, allegedly, "the Marxist concept of man and society rejects values closest to the Chilean national soul."

The junta has a single answer to accusations of human right violations leveled by world public opinion: It is only conspiracy of "international communism." In the mentioned interview Colonel Espinosa frightens the Western political leaders with the danger of communism which, allegedly, is waging a "campaign aimed at the destruction of democracy." Again and again we hear from Santiago the heart-rending voices of the fascist executioners publicizing their readiness to head a "crusade" against Marxism-Leninism.

The junta sees Marxist influence everywhere. Pinochet detects the ghost of communism even in the activities of the Chilean church hierarchy which occasionally takes up the defense of the victims of terrorism. EL MERCURIO writes that "international communism" "rules thousands of pseudodemocratic newspapers in the Western world," while the Soviet PRAVDA has penetrated with its editions "almost all the conquered (!) Western countries." If we are to believe Pinochet international communism is trying to weaken from the outside "Christian civilization" with the help of "modern methods" such as the export of revolution, terrorism, initiation of social chaos, moral confusion, and all kinds of troubles.

Anticommunism has always used vulgar and, frequently, truly fantastic slanders and falsifications to depict the communists as fiends with all the visible attributes of the forces of evil. What is the level of intellectual development and information of the public that Pinochet relies on when he tries to assure his listeners that communism is relying on "narcotics, pornography, and the breakdown of the family?" Why? It appears, for the sake of undermining the foundations of "Western civilization!"

The "new and firm democracy" created in Chile, Pinochet stated at the opening of the Sixth General Assembly of the Organization of American States, in Santiago in June 1976, has assumed the mission to protect "Christian civilization" from "permanent communist aggression." It is precisely the Chilean junta that has been allegedly able to create and codify in "constitutional acts" a new "institutional system" capable of repelling "modern forms" of this aggression.

The "new democracy" and "new institutional order" in Chile are nothing but national tyranny relying on naked force. Vulgar and primitive anticommunism

is the ideological support of this tyranny. History has frequently confirmed that the slogan of "struggle with communism above all!" has been invariably used in attempts to justify and substantiate all types of antidemocratic and, above all, fascist orders. Once again the system of fascist terror which exists in Chile is based on the same hackneyed argument.

However much the Chilean fascists may be proclaiming a "frontal onslaught" against Marxism, and however strongly they may be appealing for a "crusade" against "international communism," resorting to lies and demagogies, the socialist and communist ideals are close to and understood and cherished by the peoples of the world. While still in the prisons of the fascist junta Luis Corvalan, the courageous son of the Chilean people, said: "Marxism can never be destroyed, for it is impossible to destroy an ideology whose spirit is consistent with its epoch and with the vital interests of the majority of society."

Fascism interrupted the development of Chile as an independent country. It is destroying its economy. Through the super exploitation of the working people, of the entire people, the fascist rulers are plundering the country, surrendering the lion's share of its resources to imperialist monopolies and financial clans.

History has recorded many instructive examples of the defeat of fascist systems wherever they may have appeared. The fascist regime in Chile as well will be swept off. As one of the documents of the Chilean Communist Party states unquestionably the working people, the entire popular masses will recover from their blow and resume control over the destiny of their homeland.

5003

CSO: 1802

TWO YEARS OF FRUITFUL WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 122-125

[Review by Professor Yu. Shiryayev, doctor of economic sciences, of the information bulletin EKONOMICHESKOYE SOTRUDNICHESTVO STRAN-CHLENOV SEV]

[Text] With the development of socialist economic integration, the intensification of cooperation among CEMA-member countries, and the growth of its international prestige and influence, the need increases to provide regular coverage of the activities of the council and its organs and of the successes achieved by the fraternal countries on the basis of the use of the principles of socialist internationalism and of international economic relations of a new type.

This has been the objective of the new printed organ of the council's secretariat--the information bulletin EKONOMICHESKOYE SOTRUDNICHESTVO STRAN-CHLENOV SEV, whose first issue was published in 1975.

In a two-year period--a short time in the life of a periodical--the bulletin has proved to be an authoritative press organ whose issues were welcomed with a great deal of interest by readers of the fraternal socialist countries--specialists, scientific workers, or anyone studying CEMA activities. The bulletin has found readers beyond the comity as well, even though so far it has been published only in Russian--the working language of the council. One of the most obvious indicators of its popularity is the substantial number of references to its materials found in other periodicals and, of late, in books dedicated to cooperation among the socialist countries.

The fact that the bulletin has acquired so rapidly a readership is explained, above all, by the general interest expressed in the work of CEMA. This is not the only reason, however. Its success is largely based on the very nature of the publication and the level of its contents. For example, the previously published "Economic Information Bulletin" printed essentially official council documents and reports on the work of its organs. The topics covered by the new publication are far broader. It covers essential problems of development of cooperation among CEMA-member countries and of

socialist economic integration; it describes the nature of collective measures implemented and depicts their socioeconomic results with the help of specific examples.

The study of the available issues leads to the conclusion that the bulletin has been able to establish a successful ratio among articles covering a broad range of economic and sociopolitical problems of the socialist comity, materials dealing with specific problems of cooperation in individual sectors and realms of economic life, as well as articles of informative and informative-analytical nature.

Their interesting articles have been published on the historical experience of world socialism, the universal importance of the laws governing the building of a new society and their creative application in accordance with specific conditions and characteristics of socialism, the leading role of communist and workers parties in the building of socialism and communism, the organizations for cooperation among CEMA-member countries, and the intensification of socialist economic integration. This range of problems has been discussed by members and candidate members of politburos and central committee presidiums, central committee secretaries, leading personnel of central committees of communist and workers parties, and members of governments and heads of departments of CEMA-member countries and Yugoslavia.

Such materials include the speech by Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, and chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba at the inauguration of the 79th meeting of the CEMA Executive Committee (No 1, 1977). Recalling that the victory of the Soviet system, whose 60th anniversary will be celebrated soon, was considered by all capitalist theoreticians as the offspring of a short-lived utopia doomed to rapid traceless disappearance, he pointed out that the exploit of the Soviet people, headed by the Communist Party and Lenin, gave such an alleged utopia the noteworthy power of a splendid accomplishment. The Soviet State is displaying an unusual upsurge in the economic, cultural, and scientific and technical fields. Comrade Fidel Castro emphasized that following the establishment of CEMA the achievements of socialism were no longer the individual exploits of a people's triumphs but became the accomplishment of a comity of countries united by common ideology and by the socialist content of their economies. His address particularly concentrated on the new type of relations existing among the fraternal countries and the socialist nature of their cooperation.

The articles carried by the bulletin on the recent congresses of communist and workers parties of CEMA-member countries are of important significance. They describe the comprehensive activities of the fraternal parties for the further strengthening of the world's socialist comity. These articles focus on the study of the gradual all-round rapprochement among socialist countries. As we know, the conclusion of the objective and legitimate nature of this process was made at the 25th CPSU Congress and was confirmed and concretized at the congresses of the other communist and workers parties of CEMA-member countries. This rapprochement is also found in the various forms

of relations among fraternal countries practically tested in the past 30 years and based on the tried principles of equality, voluntary participation, mutual aid, and the principles of socialist internationalism. Reciprocal relations among fraternal countries are becoming ever closer. The common elements of their politics, economics, and social and cultural life are growing; their development levels are becoming equalized. This is a reflection of the objective needs governing the development of the members of the socialist comity and of the growing similarity of socioeconomic problems resolved by each sovereign fraternal country.

The articles describe the tremendous historical importance of the study of reciprocal experience and of determining the way the general laws governing the building of socialism operate under specific national conditions. Interpreting the experience of existing socialism is of immediate practical significance to each communist and workers party and each fraternal country, for it enables them to find optimal solutions to basic problems of social development with lesser outlays.

The bulletin's issues describe the role of the inviolable combat alliance among ruling communist parties--the very foundation of cooperation among socialist countries and its living soul and guiding and organizing force. They provide a panoramic view of the broad and systematic contacts among communists from the fraternal countries.

Being the official publication of the CEMA secretariat, the bulletin provides detailed information on the activities of the council and, above all, of its supreme organ--the session. The bulletin covered extensively the proceedings and results of the 30th CEMA Session held in Berlin in July 1976.

The delegates to the session emphasized that the course toward all-round development of socialist economic integration, jointly formulated by the heads of communist and workers parties and of governments of CEMA-member countries in 1969 has been fully justified. A sudden experience has been gained since then in the joint solution of many problems, an experience which should be used in subsequent work.

Economic cooperation among CEMA-member countries was one of the most important factors for strengthening the international prestige of the socialist comity and for the consolidation of its political positions. The processes of economic integration among socialist countries played their role in the general positive changes which marked the first half of the 1970's--the tangible turn toward detente, the development of international cooperation, and the success of the European Conference in Helsinki. This was the topic, for example, of the article by L. Strougal, member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee Presidium and Czechoslovak prime minister (No 3, 1977).

The 31st CEMA Session, held in Warsaw, in July 1977, was a new demonstration of the triumph of the idea of socialist internationalism. It was opened with a solemn session dedicated to the anniversary of the October Revolution.

The report submitted by Comrade P. Jaroszewicz, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, and the addresses by the heads of delegations of CEMA-member countries emphasized the permanent significance of the Great October Revolution--the main event of the 20th Century which marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of mankind. The participants in the session rated highly the role and experience of the CPSU and of the Soviet people in the building of the first socialist state, in strengthening the unity among fraternal countries and consolidating the peace and security. Speaking of the greatness of the October Revolution, Comrade A. N. Kosygin, head of the USSR delegation, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, noted that it is also a treasury of experience in the field of socialist changes to which all countries following the socialist path have made a contribution. The CPSU is making creative use of this experience in its activities. It is always studying and considering the theoretical and practical achievements of world socialism. Thus, the experience of the fraternal parties and countries has been reflected also in the draft of the new USSR Constitution. In turn, this constitution has enriched the collective experience of world socialism. It will represent another contribution made by the CPSU and the Soviet people to the common cause of progress and peace the world over.

The 31st CEMA Session paid great attention to the implementation of large scale measures aimed at improving mutual cooperation, among which the further conversion of this cooperation on a long-term basis, the elaboration of long-term target programs in leading economic sectors, and the increased interaction among planning organs in the solution of most topical national economic problems play a particular role.

The materials of the 31st CEMA Session will be included in the forthcoming issue of the bulletin now being signed to press.

The bulletin publishes the most important documents of the council and a chronicle of the activities of its working organs. Let us also note periodical sections carrying articles on the work of this international organization and topical statistical information. Useful information is found also in consultation on most topical problems of expanding cooperation. They provide extensive information characterizing interaction in various economic areas and describing the ways and means of cooperation.

The information bulletin systematically publishes articles by heads of collective banks and international economic organizations of CEMA-member countries. Materials on topical problems of scientific and technical cooperation, including cooperation within the framework of coordination centers in which scientists' and specialists' joint efforts for the solution of specific problems in various fields of science and technology, are regularly published in the section entitled "Scientific and Technical Cooperation Among CEMA-Member Countries."

Interesting articles are published by heads of enterprises, economic organizations, and scientific establishments in fraternal countries. They

describe specific achievements of enterprise collectives actively participating in the implementation of the complex program and disseminate progressive work experience.

Of late publication of selected articles and materials has been undertaken providing us with a comprehensive idea of the basic problems of reciprocal cooperation in the most important economic branches. Thus, issue No 5 for 1976 contains a number of articles and other materials on the development of agriculture and the food industry of CEMA-member countries, a study of the various aspects of interaction in this field, and a description of the collective efforts of communist and workers parties and governments of fraternal countries aimed at promoting progress in these sectors which directly determine the growth of the living standard of the working people. Similar selections have been published on central problems of transportation, the development of light industry and foreign trade, and others, found in No 6 for 1976, and Nos 2 and 3 for 1977.

The bulletin regularly covers relations between CEMA and other international organizations and developing countries as well as industrially advanced capitalist countries. For example, issue No 6 for 1976 describes the interaction between CEMA and Finland in transportation, and cooperation with an intergovernmental international commission such as the Danube River Commission. It carries an address by the representative of CEMA to the Second Committee of the 31st United Nations General Assembly.

The study of the issues in print indicates that the bulletin is successfully implementing its assignments. It has become a rostrum for regular materials submitted by leading party and governmental figures, big economic managers, specialists, and scientists in CEMA-member countries. The organ of the CEMA secretariat provides information on the council's activities and its documents and depicts the broad picture of multilateral and bilateral economic relations. It covers the achievements and experience of individual countries and promotes new forms of cooperation. Summing up collective experience and popularizing the achievements of CEMA, the bulletin contributes to improving the cooperation among CEMA-member countries and to the successful solution of the problems facing the communist and workers parties of the fraternal countries.

However, this is not to say that activities related to the publication of this bulletin need no corrections aimed at upgrading the bulletin's standard and insuring the wider distribution of this organ both within and outside the members of the socialist comity.

In our view, it should be taken into consideration that the council and its organs, as well as a number of international organizations publish a variety of materials for the benefit of a relatively narrow circle of specialists. Taking this circumstance into consideration, it seems to us that the bulletin could substantially increase the percentage of materials of interest to a broader readership circle. It would also be expedient for this publication to have regular sections dealing with statistical information on the economic

development and economic cooperation among CEMA-member countries, and on experience gained in cooperation with other countries.

It would be also desirable to see in the bulletin articles and reference data clarifying the principles and mechanism of CEMA activities. They would provide the workers in the mass information media with additional materials with which to expose the fabrications of bourgeois propaganda concerning CEMA. This is a particularly topical task, for the flow of such disinformation in the West is growing. Bourgeois propaganda is using all possible means to defame or belittle the factual achievements of the collective economic organization of the socialist states, achievements which are particularly clear against the background of the profound crisis experienced by the international organizations of capitalist countries.

Unquestionably, the bulletin would benefit from the information viewpoint by publishing supplements. We believe that one of them, in particular, could be an annual survey of the council's activities. This would increase the amount of objective information on the intensification of cooperation within CEMA which, in accordance with the nature and supreme objectives of socialism, leads to the harmonious development of the national economies, insures the fast growth of industry and agriculture, and contributes to the accelerated progress of economically less developed CEMA-member countries.

5003

CSO: 1802

NEEDED AND TIMELY RESEARCH

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77, pp 125-127

[Review by A. Adamishin of the book "Sovremennyye Burzhuaznyye Teorii Mezhdunarodnykh Otnosheniy. Kriticheskiy Analiz" [Contemporary Bourgeois Theories of International Relations. Critical Analysis]. Editor in Chief V. I. Gantman. Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 486 pp]

[Text] Today problems of international relations are assuming an evermore noticeable role in the ideological confrontation between the two systems. This is understandable. Under our very eyes the picture of the contemporary world is changing at a headlong pace. A turn from cold war and balancing on the brink of a nuclear catastrophe to detente and to peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems is taking place.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has pointed out that under contemporary international circumstances imperialism "can no longer hope for success by openly proclaiming its true objectives. It is forced to develop an entire system of ideological myths which conceal the true meaning of its intentions and dulls the vigilance of the peoples."

Life itself has led the leaders of the bourgeois world to the conclusion that today one can no longer seriously hope to resolve the historical dispute between socialism and capitalism by the force of arms. Since this is so, the question of how to pursue a foreign policy and build international relations under the new conditions which have changed not by the will of imperialism has risen to its full dimension.

Currently a bourgeois science of international relations (frequently still concealed within bourgeois political science or even sociology) has branched out and developed as a relatively autonomous and sufficiently widespread trend aimed at servicing the practical foreign political needs of the ruling class. This branch of bourgeois social science claims not only to study empirical data related to the foreign policy of states and international relations but to elaborate certain "theoretical" structures of a general or specific nature.

Naturally, the implementation of the Leninist foreign policy, formulated by the 25th CPSU Congress, and the interests of the development of Soviet social science demand of our scientists-internationalists a serious study of the latest bourgeois theories of international relations. Such an assignment was assumed by the collective of associates of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which prepared a systematic study on this topic.

A characteristic feature of the work under review is, above all, the fact that the study and criticism of bourgeois theories are invariably based on the positions of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of international relations; such theories are always considered in their relation with the practical policy of capitalist states and of imperialist economics, politics, and ideology. Following this approach, the authors substantiatedly conclude that "in principle all bourgeois schools in the field of international relations have been unable to withstand a confrontation with history. They proved their alienation from real grounds and inconsistency of historical processes, as well as inability to provide an objective study and forecast of laws, trends, and prospects governing their development" (p. 9). On the one hand, pragmatism and empiricism, stemming from the lack of a truly scientific conceptual research base and their narrow class and practical direction, and, on the other, a trend toward "pure" theory and abstract systems and structures deprived of practical meaning and real content, have become inseparable features of bourgeois studies of international relations.

The book presents a broad panoramic view of works by bourgeois authors in this area: It reflects practically all of its basic trends which appeared or have existed in the postwar period through 1975. They are considered not separately but in the process of their historical evolution, closely interconnected and related to the development of the postwar international relations.

The implementation of this task called for the creative interpretation and processing of tremendous factual data. A considerable percentage of the works included have not been critically analyzed in Soviet literature and some of them have remained either unknown or little known to the Soviet reader. This applies, above all, to the individual methods used for the study of systems of international relations, the analysis and modeling of international conflicts, models of "stability" of the contemporary system, as well as a number of general theoretical trends. The authors make a thorough study of the characteristics of the leading "schools" of the bourgeois science of international relations, of "idealism" and "realism" in particular and, subsequently, of "traditionalism" and "modernism" in foreign political studies by bourgeois scientists. Proving that all these and some other "schools" share, above all, a common class-ideological trend dictated by service to the interests of the exploiting classes, the authors reach the just conclusion that one cannot seriously speak of the struggle between ideological and political views, not to mention of methodology in the bourgeois science of international relations.

The monograph considers extensively the attempts by bourgeois scientists to create particular or general "theories" of the foreign policy of the states and its role in international relations. Along with the views of familiar representatives of "political realism" as H. Morgenthau, G. Kennan, R. Osgood, H. Kissinger, G. Ball, and others, the authors attentively consider relatively new, little known trends of bourgeois science such as psychological and sociopsychological concepts of "governmental behavior," and sociological, economic, and cybernetic foreign policy "theories" intensively elaborated in the West. They include particularly pretentious attempts to approach international relations from the positions of a general theory of systems (naturally, ignoring the specific-historical and class content of international relations).

A very attentive study is made of the basic theoretical concepts and methodologies of bourgeois authors used in the study of international conflicts--one of the main and most extensively written about subjects of bourgeois foreign political thinking. Naturally, this is no accident. The very topic has reflected the most important and vitally typical problem of world politics triggered by the nature of imperialism.

Correspondingly, as though to balance this, the authors have thoroughly collected and considered the theoretical approaches of bourgeois science to the most topical problem of contemporary international relations created by the influence of socialism: the problem of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. Criticizing false bourgeois concepts such as artificially pitting "peaceful cooperation" against peaceful coexistence, and the interpretation of peaceful coexistence as a "guarantee" of the inviolability of capitalism, the division of the contemporary world into "spheres of influence" and attempts to replace (or "supplement") peaceful coexistence with "ideological coexistence" between the two systems, the authors try to depict also the views of bourgeois scientists which provide a more realistic assessment of contemporary international relations, showing and emphasizing the need for the further strengthening and broadening of detente and the development of mutually profitable international cooperation.

Emphasizing the essential unity of class-ideological and conceptual positions of bourgeois scientists belonging to different schools and trends, the authors justifiably direct the attention to the process of stratification which is developing in their views essentially under the influence of the crisis of imperialist foreign policy. As the result of this demarcation, of late the role which bourgeois scientists who favor detente and a policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation among countries with different social systems play is becoming evermore noticeable. We must agree with the fact that taking such stratification into consideration is of practical value.

As L. I. Brezhnev has noted, the prospects for a further intensification of the detente process call for the all-round, sincere, and efficient cooperation among governments and representatives of economic and scientific circles.

Emphasizing, rather than deleting the need for waging an irreconcilable ideological struggle, such cooperation among scientists in the interests of peace could make a positive contribution to the further development of the detente process and to the search for practical means for insuring peace and security.

Naturally, with all these merits the work is not deprived of shortcomings. The individual parts of the book are not of equal value in terms of content and depth of analysis. Western military-strategic doctrines are also directly related to the shaping of foreign policy: "Mass action," "Flexible reaction," "Realistic restraint," and others. Yet, they are discussed less thoroughly in the book. One could have expected of a work claiming to be a comprehensive study of an entire scientific direction the interpretation of some other aspects of bourgeois science, particularly concepts and methods used in forecasting the developments of international relations, and theories of the interrelationship between international relations and foreign policy, on the one hand, and ecological problems and problems of the scientific and technical revolution, on the other, and others. The absence of a name index is a clear omission in a work based on such extensive factual data (incidentally, this is characteristic of many other publications).

All this, however, does not change the assessment of what has been accomplished in this work. It has fulfilled its task: the reader has been given a book the need for which had been long felt. The critical study of bourgeois theories of international relations enables us to clarify more profoundly the nature of the ideological confrontation in this important realm of social life and the complexity of the struggle for detente and for the reorganization of foreign policy on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

5003

CSO: 1802

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 77 pp 127-128

[Book list]

[Text] V. I. Lenin, "O Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [On the Social Revolution]. A collection. In two volumes, Vol 1--1899-1917. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 351 pp.

"Lenin. Partiya. Oktyabr'." [Lenin. Party. October]. Documents and materials. A collection compiled by I. V. Il'ina et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 152 pp.

"Lenin. Oktyabr' Semnadsatogo" [Lenin. October 1917]. A documentary narration in two volumes. Compiled by A. I. Ivanskiy, Politizdat, Moscow, 1977. Vol 1, 336 pp; Vol 2, 360 pp.

"Bor'ba Partii Bol'shevikov za Armiyu v Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [The Struggle of the Bolshevik Party for the Army in the Socialist Revolution]. A collection of documents. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 520 pp.

"Konstitutsiya (Osnovnoy Zakon) Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik" [Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics]. Draft of the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted by the Constitutional Commission and approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for nationwide discussion. Izvestiya, Moscow, 1977, 61 pp.

L. I. Brezhnev. "O Proyeekte Konstitutsii Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik" [On the Draft of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics]. Report submitted to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 24 May 1977. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 16 pp.

"Rasskazy o Partii" [Stories About the Party]. Artistic-documentary collection in three volumes. Compiled by L. D. Davydov. Second enlarged edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977; Vol 1, 432 pp; Vol 2, 512 pp; Vol 3, 416 pp.

- I. Ye. Vorozheykin and S. L. Senyavskiy. "Rabochiy Klass--Vedushchaya Sila Sovetskogo Obshchestva" [The Working Class--The Leading Force of Soviet Society] (Problems of Methodology and Historiography). Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 374 pp.
- L. S. Gaponenko. "Reshayushchaya Sila Velikogo Oktyabrya" [The Decisive Force of the Great October], Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 272 pp.
- A. G. Dement'yev. "V. I. Lenin i Sovetskaya Literatura" [V. I. Lenin and Soviet Literature]. Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, Moscow, 1977, 389 pp.
- K. I. Zarodov. "Sotsializm, Mir, Revolyutsiya" [Socialism, Peace, Revolution]. Some problems of the theory and practice of international relations and the class struggle. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 304 pp.
- "I Doveriye i Otvetstvennost'" [Trust and Responsibility]. Collection of articles compiled by V. Ye. Potapenko. PRAVDA, Moscow, 1977, 190 pp.
- V. A. Medvedev. "Sotsialisticheskoye Proizvodstvo" [Socialist Production]. Political-Economic Study. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1976, 323 pp.
- V. S. Ovchinnikov. "Ideynoye Yedinstvo Razvityego Sotsialisticheskogo Obshchestva" [The Ideological Unity of Developed Socialist Society]. Philosophical essay. Lenizdat, Leningrad, 1976, 183 pp.
- F. Ya. Polyanskiy. "Kritika V. I. Leninym Antimarksistskikh Ekonomicheskikh Teoriy" [V. I. Lenin's Criticism of Anti-Marxist Economic Theories], Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 320 pp.
- "Problemy Sotsialisticheskogo Obraza Zhizni" [Problems of the Socialist Way of Life]. Editor in Chief M. N. Rutkevich. Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 286 pp.
- R. V. Puchkov. "V Storone ot Avtostrady" [Away From the Highway]. Behind the facade of bourgeois "prosperity." Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 216 pp.
- "Rabochaya Kniga Sotsiologa" [The Sociologist's Handbook]. Editor in Chief G. V. Osipov. Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 509 pp.
- Sh. P. Sanakoyev and N. I. Kapchenko. "O Teorii Vneshney Politiki Sotsializma" [On the Theory of the Foreign Policy of Socialism], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1977, 296 pp.
- N. A. Slamikhin. "Razoblachenie V. I. Leninym Teorii i Praktiki Trotskizma (1917-1924 gg.)" [V. I. Lenin's Exposure of Trotskyite Theory and Practice], Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 336 pp.
- "Sovetskaya Demokratiya v Period Razvityego Sotsializma" [Soviet Democracy in the Period of Developed Socialism]. Editor in Chief D. A. Kerimov. Mysl', Moscow, 1976, 279 pp.

"Sovetskoye Gosudarstvo i Progressivnoye Razvitiye Mezhdunarodnogo Prava" [The Soviet State and the Progressive Development of International Law], Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1977, 256 pp.

"Sovremennaya Burzhuaznaya Filosofiya i Religiya" [Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy and Religion]. Edited by A. S. Bogomolov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 376 pp.

"Sotsialisticheskaya Ekonomicheskaya Integratsiya" [Socialist Economic Integration]. Edited by B. N. Ladygin and N. A. Zotova. Mysl', Moscow, 1977, 335 pp.

L. N. Tolkunov. "Trudnyye Dorogi Mira" [The Hard Roads to Peace]. From confrontation to detente. Izvestiya, Moscow, 1977, 384 pp.

Ye. M. Tyazhel'nikov. "Soyuz Molodykh Lenintsev" [Union of Young Leninists]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 352 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST, 1977

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -